UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

"We Can Construct What Needs to Still be Done": Reformulating the Politics and Pedagogies of Academic Writing Programs in Higher Education

Permalink

Author

Lee, Katherine H.

Publication Date

2021

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara

"We Can Construct What Needs to Still be Done": Reformulating the Politics and Pedagogies of

Academic Writing Programs in Higher Education

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

Requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Education

by

Katherine H. Lee

Committee in charge:

Professor Rebeca Mireles-Rios, Co-Chair

Professor Diane C. Fujino, Co-Chair

Professor George Lipsitz

March 2021

The dissertation of Katherine H. Lee is approved.

_____

George Lipsitz

_____

Diane C. Fujino, Committee Co-Chair

_____

Rebeca Mireles-Rios, Committee Co-Chair

March 2021

"We Can Construct What Needs to Still be Done": Reformulating the Politics and Pedagogies of

Academic Writing Programs in Higher Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The participants and stakeholders in this study as well as the many students I worked with over the years have reminded me that our collective dialogues are essential for producing the insights that help us to remember why this work matters. They have spent an extraordinary amount of time working with me in the midst of their busy teaching, mentoring, and advising schedules so I could build the contexts and understandings necessary for understanding their work and visions. The many hours we spent working together, thinking critically, arguing, talking through misunderstandings, and finding ways to build new possibilities have deeply shaped my work as an instructor and researcher. I thank them for their ongoing patience with me, particularly as I struggled to understand what was clear to them and when I failed to ask the questions that needed to be asked. They have held me accountable to higher ethical and analytical standards, pushing me to think, teach, and research differently and in better ways. I am indebted to them for sharing their work and stories, for challenging me, and for always forcing me to face and respond to the realities that I was unable or unwilling to see.

VITA OF KATHERINE H. LEE
March 2021

EDUCATION

Ph.D.   University of California, Santa Barbara, Education, March 2021 (expected)

M.A.   University of California, Santa Barbara, Education, December 2018

M.A.   University of Chicago, Humanities, June 2007

B.A.   University of California, Berkeley, English, May 2005

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

Teaching Experience

Adjunct Instructor, Department of English, Holy Names University, 2019
- English 1A: Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing
- English 133WB: Topics in American Literature: Social Justice Narratives

Lecturer, Merritt Writing Program, University of California, Merced, 2013-2016
- Writing 1: Academic Writing
- Writing 10: Reading & Composition
- Writing 110: Tutor Training
- CORE 1: The World At Home (Interdisciplinary General Education)

Co-Instructor, Center for Writing & Scholarship, California Institute of Integral Studies, 2011-2013
- CT 6137: Teaching Academic Writing: Theory and Practice
- CT 6138: Research in the Teaching of Academic Writing
- CT 6139: Teaching Academic Writing: Leading Classes, Workshops & Groups
- CT 6140: Teaching Academic Writing: Integrative Research Seminar

Adjunct Instructor, Department of English, Diablo Valley Community College, 2009
- English 116: College Reading Development
- English 118: College Writing Development

Instructor, College Writing Programs Summer Bridge, University of California, Berkeley, Summers 2008, 2009, 2010
- College Writing N2: Writing the Bridge: From High School to the University

Lecturer, College Writing Programs, University of California, Berkeley, 2007-2009
- College Writing R1A: Accelerated Reading & Composition

Seminar Leader, Student Learning Center, University of California, Berkeley, 2005-2006
- Education 197/English 310: Field Studies in Tutoring Writing

Administrative Experience

Program Coordinator, Teaching & Learning Center, Foothill College, 2020-present

Founding Director, Center for Writing & Scholarship, California Institute of Integral Studies, 2011-2013

Associate Director, Center for Academic Achievement, Lesley University, 2010-2011

Assistant Writing Program Coordinator, Student Learning Center, University of California, Berkeley, 2005-2006

Teaching Assistant Experience

Teaching Assistant, Department of Asian American Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2017-2018
- AS AM 1: Introduction to Asian American History
- AS AM 9: Asian American, Black, Chicana/o & Indigenous Freedom Struggles

Teaching Assistant, Department of English, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2018
- ENGL 1: Introduction to Literary Study

Teaching Fellow, School Kids Investigating Language in Life & Society (SKILLS), University of California, Santa Barbara/Santa Barbara City College/Dos Pueblos High, 2017
- Anthropology 104: Linguistic Anthropology/Language and Society (dual enrollment course)

Teaching Assistant, Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2016-2017
- CH ST 1: Introduction to Chicano/Latino Studies: A Historical Perspective

Course Reader, Department of English, University of California, Berkeley, 2010
- English 118: Milton's Poetry and Prose

Discussion Leader, Student Learning Center Summer Bridge Program, University of California, Berkeley, 2007
- Ethnic Studies 20AC: Racism and Sexism in Higher Education (Summer Bridge)

Writing Workshop Leader, Student Learning Center Summer Bridge Program, University of California, Berkeley, 2003-2006
- College Writing N2: Writing the Bridge: From High School to the University
- Ethnic Studies 21AC: Introduction to Racial and Ethnic Groups in the U.S.
- Chicana/o Studies R1AN: Reading & Composition: Introduction to the Literature of the Chicana/o Borderlands
- English 98: Reading & Composition Writing Workshop for English R1B

- English R1AN: Reading & Composition: LA Stories: Racial Unrest in the Late American City

Discussion Leader, Student Learning Center, University of California, Berkeley, 2005
- English 95: Other Voices: Multicultural Literary Perspectives

Writing Tutor, Student Learning Center, University of California, Berkeley, 2002-2005

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Graduate Student Researcher, Department of Asian American Studies (P.I.: Diane Fujino), University of California, Santa Barbara, 2018-2019
- Project: Contemporary Asian American Activism and Intergenerational Perspectives

Undergraduate Research Assistant, Department of English (P.I.: Colleen Lye), University of California, Berkeley, 2004-2005
- Project: Asian American Literary Form and History

PUBLICATIONS

Lee, K.H. (in press). "Organizing Wherever Your Feet Land: Reconceptualizing Writing and Writing Instruction in the Legacy of Asian American Activism." In R. Magalit Rodriguez & D.C. Fujino (Eds.), *Contemporary Asian American Activism: Building Movements for Liberation*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Lee, K. H. (Summer 2014). Student-centered education: Using students' histories as readers and writers to redesign writing instruction and curriculum. In *Learning the "write" way*. University of California, Merced Writing Project.

Lee, K. H. (Summer 2014). "We'll see you at the barricades." In *Learning the "write" way*. University of California, Merced Writing Project.

Lee, K. H. (December 2010). The 2012 U.C. admissions policy and its impact on students of color. Written for Committee for Equitable Admissions Policies blog: http://equitableadmissions.wordpress.com/

Hong, C. J. & Lee, K. H. (2009, September 18). A private university system of the future? *The Daily Californian*.

Hong, C. J., Lee, K. H., & Leong, A. (2009, July 20). What really happened to diversity? *The Daily Californian*.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Putney, L.G. (chair), de Sena, N.A., Lee, K.H., Scott, C.E., Decker, L., Scott, C., Huerta, M., Garza, T. (2017, January 30). "Analysis of Learning Opportunities Through Diverse Curricula in University Writing Classes." Session title: "Creating opportunities for writing, literacy and learning for diverse students: Ethnographic and cognitive research perspectives." Symposium at Annual Conference for Academic Research in Education (CARE), Las Vegas, NV.

Lee, K.H. (2014, October 11). "Teaching Students to Identify and Analyze Rich Evidence." (Presenter. Session title: "Teaching Writing with the New Common Core"). Presentation at UC Merced Writing Project Professional Development Saturday Outreach Series. Merced, CA.

Bronson, M.C. & Lee, K.H. (2012, January 12). "(Re-)Writing the World: Epistemological Diversity in the Curriculum and Response to Student Work." Presentation at the California Institute of Integral Studies Spring 2012 Faculty Retreat. San Francisco, CA.

Hong, C.J., Lee, K.H., Lee, A.K., Leong, A. & Wang, L. (2014, May 14). "Diversity at Risk: New U.C. Admissions Policy." Presentation at University of California, Santa Cruz Asian American Pacific Islander Heritage Month Education Forum. Santa Cruz, CA.

Larkin, M., Lee, K.H., Oakes, K. & Sloan, R. (2009, March 14). "'My History as a Writer': Teacher as Student Writer." Session title: "Unmasking the teacher: Letting students get to know (all about?) you"). Panel presentation delivered at Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, CA.

Lee, K.H., Chiang, S., Skolnick, D. (2009, February 17). "How to Manage the Paper Load: Time-Saving Strategies for More Effective Teaching." Panel Presentation at College Writing Programs "Classroom in Progress" Brownbag Series. University of California, Berkeley.

Lee, K.H., Flash, D., Hammons, J., Kirn, H. (2008, September 23). "When Good Teachers Give Bad Assignments: Learning from Classroom Flops." Panel Presentation at College Writing Programs "Classroom in Progress" Brownbag Series. University of California, Berkeley.

Lee, K.H., Baptiste, M., Levine, J. (2008, April 17). "From Professional Conference to Classroom Practice." Panel presentation at College Writing Programs "Classroom in Progress" Brownbag Series. University of California, Berkeley.

Lee, K.H., Bobo, S. (2008, February 28). "Engaging Students Beyond the Classroom: (More) Approaches to Student-Teacher Conferences." Roundtable discussion at College Writing Programs "Classroom in Progress" Brownbag Series. University of California, Berkeley.

Lee, K.H., Simon, J., Brooks, S.R.F., Sanchez, M. (2004, March 6). "Writing Our Voices: The Use of Personal Narratives and Peer-Teaching for Educational Empowerment." Panel presentation at Northern California Writing Centers Association Conference. Stanford University.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Member, Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee, Foothill College, 2021-present

Writing Project Teacher-Consultant, University of California, Merced Writing Project/ California Writing Project, 2014-present

Member, Supplemental Writing Instruction Committee, Merritt Writing Program, University of California, Merced, 2013-2015

Co-Facilitator, Writing 1/Writing 10 Professional Development Reading Group, Merritt Writing Program, University of California, Merced, 2013-2014

Member, Non-Senate Faculty Professional Development Funds Committee, University of California, Merced, 2013

Member, Representation & Communication Subcommittee of the CIIS Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice Committee, California Institute of Integral Studies, 2012-2013

Member, Diversity Council, Lesley University, 2010-2011

Member, Asian Pacific Islander Education and Languages NOW! (APIEL NOW!), University of California, Berkeley, 2009-2011

Member, ASUC Publication Awards Selection Committee, University of California, Berkeley, Spring 2009

Member, PanAsian Solidarity Coalition, University of Chicago, Spring 2007

EDITORIAL SERVICE

Editor, McNair Scholars Research Journal, University of California, Berkeley, 2009-2010

Editorial Assistant, Department of Public Health (P.I.: Daniel Perlman) University of California, Berkeley, 2006-2008
- Project: Perlman, D. & Roy, A. (2009). *The practice of international health: A case-based orientation.* New York, NY: Oxford.

COMMUNITY WORK

Workplace Literacy Volunteer Teacher, Asian Immigrant Women Advocates, 2020

Volunteer Writer and Data Analyst, Chinese Progressive Association, 2013, 2016
- City-Wide Housing Report
- District 11 (Excelsior) Housing Report
- Eva Lowe Fellowship Booklet

GRANTS AND AWARDS

Dissertation Completion Block Grant, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California Santa Barbara, 2019-2020

Block Grant Fellowship, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2017-2019

Alumni Fellowship Fund Award, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2017

ABSTRACT

"We Can Construct What Needs to Still be Done": Reformulating the Politics and Pedagogies of

Academic Writing Programs in Higher Education

by

Katherine H. Lee

This dissertation examines the challenges academic writing programs in higher education have faced in serving students of color and low-income students. Although there is a growing recognition in the field of writing studies that the disciplinary frameworks and ideologies that structure academic writing classes have historically disenfranchised students of color, the field continues to struggle to find ways to address this problem effectively. Efforts to adopt diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives have focused largely on curricular and pedagogical change, but these add-on approaches still rely on using disciplinary standards and frameworks that reproduce racial inequities. This study challenges the assumption that change in academic writing programs must begin with classroom pedagogy and argues that pedagogical change cannot be understood or implemented apart from critical analysis of the institutional and ideological contexts that structure both universities and academic writing programs. This study examines the specific institutional, ideological, and disciplinary contexts in which composition programs' relationship with racial inequities must be understood. It specifically focuses on the roles that neoliberalism, the merit and "teaching excellence" review process, stratified labor structures, and the ongoing standardization of learning outcomes play in reproducing inequities in academic writing classes along racial and economic lines. Taking the University of California (UC) as a case study, this dissertation analyzes how the UC writing programs in particular have worked within these institutional, economic, disciplinary, and ideological constraints.

The chapters in this dissertation demonstrate that while the field of writing studies has struggled to break free of these dominant frameworks, there is a long history of instructors and students who have directly challenged the racial power structures that shape university writing programs and the larger field of writing studies. Many of these histories, however, have been left out of or rewritten in the field's dominant narratives. This dissertation recovers the forgotten history of the key role that ethnic studies programs have played in redefining and reenvisioning the work and politics of academic writing, with particular attention to the long fight in the UC Berkeley Asian American Studies program to build and teach its own writing classes. These stories of instructor and student resistance, both past and present, offer alternative models, pedagogies, and methodologies for academic writing instruction. By recovering these histories and instructors' structural analysis of the disciplinary and institutional frameworks that reproduce racial inequities in academic writing classes, this dissertation reveals that the analytical tools, methodologies, and visions needed to bring new possibilities for the field into being have always existed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

On February 19, 2009, one year after severe budget cuts had decimated the Asian language courses in the UC Berkeley Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures (EALC), the UC Berkeley student group Asian Pacific Islander Education and Languages NOW (APIEL NOW) hosted a public forum to make visible the university's ongoing disinvestment in Asian and Pacific Islander language (API) education on campus. Although UC Berkeley had opened the new C.V. Starr East Asian Library in 2008, which merged the extensive language holdings of the East Asian Library and the Center for Chinese Studies Library, the university had been diverting resources away from API language education for years through reduced course offerings, increasingly precarious funding, and little job security for the language lecturers. Recognizing the need for the campus community to see API languages as more than "service education," APIEL NOW called for the formation of a task force comprised of faculty, students, and community members that would engage in campus- and community-based organizing efforts to demonstrate that API languages were an essential part of a contemporary, interdisciplinary education for a 21st century world. Among APIEL NOW's goals were to highlight the relevance of API languages as living, local, and global languages; to push for institutional support for the formation and sustained growth of API language majors, minors, course offerings, and graduate programs; and to fight for job security for API language instructors. As the student, faculty, and community panelists made clear, this was just one part of what had been and would continue to be an ongoing fight to transform the perception on campus that API languages were a marginal and expendable form of service education. Both Ling-chi Wang and Elaine Kim argued that for API languages to be seen as a vital part of a university education, the university would need to throw away the anachronistic, liberal arts belief that heritage languages were less important than ancient European languages. Pointing to

1

UC Berkeley's university writing requirement — formerly known as the Subject A requirement — as one example of the university's long history of seeing bilingualism as detrimental to students' education, Kim argued that language study in fact encompassed more than just the language itself: language study was central to the study of culture, literature, history, politics, and education, and thus was integral to the interdisciplinary work that students, faculty, and community members were doing outside of the EALC department. In order to build forms of education capable of serving contemporary community needs in the twenty-first century, the university would have to transform how it thought about API language education and curriculum. According to Kim, student activism and the organizing efforts of APIEL NOW would be critical for precipitating these much-needed ideological and structural changes in language education at Berkeley.

As a relatively new lecturer in the UC Berkeley College Writing Programs at the time with little knowledge of the overlapping history of academic writing on campus and the administration's ongoing disinvestment in Asian and Southeast Asian languages, I was struck as I listened to the APIEL NOW speakers by the extent to which they still perceived the Subject A writing requirement as linked to the ongoing problems that EALC lecturers and language classes faced. The University of California had long eliminated remedial courses from its course offerings under the 1990 "Gardner Initiative" (Stanley, 2010, p. 131). For well over fifteen years, the College Writing Programs had offered a 6-unit writing class that combined its Subject A for Non-native Speakers (SANSE) course with its entry-level university writing course in an effort to remove the stigmas of remediation and English as a Second Language (ESL) from academic writing (Stanley, 2010). By eliminating the distinction between ESL, "remedial," and "regular" students and by hiring writing instructors who not only specialized in working with multilingual students but who also valued students' home languages and cultures, the College Writing Programs had seemed to align their values and visions for students of color with those of

APIEL NOW and EALC language lecturers. Both programs were fighting to ensure their work would not be restricted to the constraints of service education and prerequisites and, moreover, were trying to build the language and literacy foundations they each felt students of color and multilingual students would need to pursue their interests across disciplines and outside of the university. Yet, despite the improvements the College Writing Programs had made, APIEL NOW recognized that the writing program's underlying charge to help students master standard English and reproduce disciplinary norms in academic writing was still at odds with APIEL NOW's belief that multilingualism was central to a contemporary, relevant education for the 21st century.

In the weeks following the forum, I began to attend and participate in the weekly APIEL NOW organizing meetings and watched as the student participants began to design the analytical, conceptual, and practical tools they needed to demonstrate the important role that Asian, South Asian, and Southeast Asian languages played in their education. They worked together to link their understanding of community languages to other issues on campus, putting into practice each week what they, Kim, and Wang had stated in the forum: that community languages encompassed more than just the language itself and were essential for building an interdisciplinary education that would be relevant to students, communities, and the changing world. As I worked with the students to build political analysis and observed how they connected the struggles of the EALC language classes to other struggles on campus — budget cuts, labor issues, admissions policy changes, disciplinary standards, and more — I began to wonder about the College Writing Programs' silence. Forum participants had publicly named the university writing requirement as something that continued to reinforce negative perceptions of bilingualism and multilingualism on campus, but the writing program had not made a concerted effort to meet with the students or to join APIEL NOW's open organizing meetings to engage with, learn from, and work with them to address their concerns or to reconceptualize the

program's practices. Through their work on language education on campus and their efforts to build novel analysis and connections between seemingly disparate events in the university, the students in APIEL NOW were making visible many of the limitations of the performance standards university writing instructors were expected to help their students meet. Yet, much of this important work was seemingly never seen or recognized by the College Writing Programs or by university administrators. What was lost because of this missed opportunity for the writing program to be in conversation with the students, EALC lecturers, and ethnic studies faculty about their shared interests in supporting students of color? Why and how were the methods that the university writing program had adopted to serve students of color inadequate? What were the ideological and methodological frameworks that would have helped to transform writing classes so that students could see them as spaces that, like API languages, were foundational to their educations rather than ones that undermined their cross-disciplinary interests?

The underlying problem that motivates this study is how writing instructors can better understand the contexts, histories, and ideological frameworks that are essential for working more effectively with students of color in academic writing classes. As the APIEL NOW forum demonstrates, there has been a persistent disconnect between the ideologies that structure the work of writing programs in higher education and how low-income students and students of color experience those classes. English language, literacy, and academic writing have long been used to disenfranchise communities of color through literacy tests, conflicts over bilingual education, the denigration of dialects and "non-standard" forms of English, and the use of disciplinary standards as a gatekeeping mechanism. The reading and writing skills that students are expected to master in academic writing classes are presented as neutral and objective when in fact they often reproduce disciplinary standards that limit what counts as knowledge and that force students to assimilate to dominant logics and linguistic forms. Although many university

writing programs have since adopted diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives, and have readily embraced efforts to move away from remediation via blended reading, writing, and ESL classes, they arguably still use curriculum, pedagogies, and disciplinary standards that continue to reproduce racial inequities. This study seeks to understand how and why university writing programs consistently fall short of being sites where students of color can engage in the struggle for racial justice.

I move beyond the common assumption that change in writing programs must start with pedagogical practice in the classroom and instead examine how pedagogical transformation cannot be understood or implemented apart from critical and sustained analysis of the structural, institutional, and ideological contexts that structure academic writing in higher education. As such, this dissertation examines the overlooked histories, institutional practices, and interdisciplinary contexts that are critical for understanding why academic writing programs have faced ongoing difficulties both in identifying and serving the needs of low-income and underrepresented students of color in higher education. These contexts include the rise of neoliberalism in higher education, the administrative push to link pedagogical practice in academic writing instruction to the notion of "teaching excellence" and standardized learning outcomes, and the ongoing institutional labor struggles that writing instructors face as they try to serve students of color. Composition rarely links these contexts to racial justice in academic writing programs; however, they reveal that larger economic structures, ideologies, disciplinary standards, and labor structures within universities are not neutral. They are designed to prioritize market-based efficiency and directly impact how writing programs and writing instructors work both within and against disciplinary frameworks as they help students of color. My study demonstrates that the field has paid insufficient attention to these forces when considering how best to serve and support underrepresented students in academic writing classes. The tendency to focus exclusively on pedagogical change comes at the expense of critically examining how

universities are structured to reproduce racial disparities through seemingly race-neutral learning outcomes, assessment standards, reward systems, and labor structures.

While describing how university writing programs and the field of composition studies continue to be structured by dominant frameworks and methodologies, this study also demonstrates that these dominant frameworks have never been stable or inevitable. Although university writing programs are charged with teaching students to master skills in reading, writing, and language that will serve them in their academic and professional careers, these goals and standards are not the only ways that composition has been defined or imagined. Catherine Prendergast (2003) argues that "if literacy has been the site of struggle for racial justice since the civil rights movement, it is because it has been for so many years the site of racial injustice in America" (p. 2). Her work reminds us that the racial hierarchies and disciplinary norms that structure literacy both in and outside of the academy are always contested — that the politics and work of academic writing, and that dominant literacy standards, are continuously challenged, dismantled, reconceptualized, and reconfigured by those who are disenfranchised by these norms. My study builds on the work of Carmen Kynard (2013) and Haivan Hoang (2015), whose research demonstrates that the foundational role that Black and Asian American student activists played in transforming academic writing classes in the 1960s and 1970s has largely been erased by the dominant narrative of composition studies. Kynard and Hoang show that Black and Asian American students created their own forms of literacy and education to challenge racist practices and expectations in writing classes, and in so doing, built spaces outside of writing classes where they could simultaneously practice writing as a vehicle for social and political change while also pressuring university writing programs to reassess their ideological and pedagogical methods. Hoang's and Kynard's work locates student literacy and political activities outside of the writing classroom (including their active participation in self-sponsored

6

publications and social movements) as the critical drivers that forced university writing programs to change their pedagogies.

To build on Hoang's and Kynard's work, I recover the history of how Black and Asian students and instructors at UC Berkeley fought to design and control their own academic writing classes within the university in the newly formed Ethnic Studies department in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Although UC Berkeley's Native American Studies and Chicana/o and Latina/o Studies programs also established their own reading and composition courses, this study specifically focuses on the early efforts of UC Berkeley's Afro-American Student Union (AASU) and Asian Studies division (now the Asian American and Asian Diaspora Studies program) to establish the groundbreaking visions for academic writing that the Chicana/o and Latina/o Studies and Native American Studies programs would eventually adopt. The AASU, Asian Studies division, and Black and Asian students and instructors at UC Berkeley were the first to name the racist ideologies, practices, and policies that structured the Subject A writing requirement on campus and became the de facto leaders who not only exposed the damaging impacts of Subject A for students of color, immigrant students, and multilingual students, but who also took the lead in reconceptualizing academic writing pedagogies and policies on campus. Instructors and students in the Asian Studies division in particular reenvisioned and redefined the work of academic writing so that students could use it to develop solutions for the urgent problems their communities faced. I demonstrate that in order to understand why academic writing programs continue to struggle to serve students of color, researchers, writing instructors, and administrators must examine the sites where students and instructors have resisted the constraints of the discourses they have been expected to adopt. There is a long and rich history of ethnic studies programs redefining the politics of academic writing and using academic writing as a tool to change the material circumstances in which low-income communities and students of color live and work. Recovering the history of the extensive work

7

that ethnic studies programs like UC Berkeley's African American Studies and Asian American Studies programs have done to challenge the dominant disciplinary practices in writing studies reveals that academic writing programs themselves have played important roles in creating and exacerbating the challenges they now face in meeting students of color's needs: academic writing programs have consistently ignored the alternative models, pedagogies, and methodologies for academic writing instruction that ethnic studies programs and writing instructors have developed over the past fifty years. Emerging examples of fruitful collaboration between Ethnic Studies departments and composition programs, such as the work being done at San Francisco State University, suggest that university writing programs need to engage in sustained, cross-disciplinary collaboration with ethnic studies programs to serve students more effectively.[1]

Although my study examines and exposes many problems with how academic writing classes are taught, I am not necessarily criticizing the value of writing classes or writing instruction. My intent is to show how current institutional priorities as well as the economic constraints and disciplinary frameworks within which writing programs are expected to operate reproduce values and skills that are presented as race-neutral, but that have historically forced students of color to assimilate to dominant literacy standards while using deficit logics to explain what are in fact structural and ideological problems. I show in this study that there are other pedagogies and ways of thinking about the work of academic writing that allow students of color to work on projects that are meaningful to them and that have real stakes in their lives. These forms of writing instruction work against the politics of remediation and assimilation,

---

[1] At San Francisco State University's (SFSU) Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CEETL), faculty from SFSU's Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines (WAC/WID) program and faculty from the Asian American Studies department have collaboratively designed an institute to help faculty learn how to teach writing using anti-racist pedagogies. The institute has been redesigned so that faculty learn how to teach writing using writing pedagogies from ethnic studies. I discuss this collaborative work between Wei Ming Dariotis (Faculty Director of CEETL), Juliana Van Olphen (SFSU's Writing Director), and Jolie Goorjian (SFSU's Writing Associate Director) in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

and instead demonstrate that academic writing can be used for social change and for solving problems that communities of color face.

Why the University of California?

I focus on the University of California (UC) system for this study. I look specifically at the diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives that the system has developed over the years and analyze how these initiatives have shaped the learning outcomes and pedagogical practices in the writing programs at different UC campuses. While these standards and commitments to teaching writing to diverse student populations are specific to the UC system, they also shape the ways that other educational institutions approach academic writing. Faculty within the UC system, including Dana Ferris, Margi Wald, Linda Adler-Kassner, Jan Frodesen, Iris Ruiz, Charles Bazerman, and others are regarded as leaders in theoretical and praxis-based research in the fields of composition studies, applied linguistics, and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Their theoretical research and applied approaches to working with students in composition and ESL classrooms have not only shaped pedagogical practices and disciplinary frameworks in the field, but have also played key roles in moving writing instructors away from deficit models of instruction by transforming how they perceive and work with multilingual students and students of color. Adler-Kassner and Bazerman in particular have been central in helping to define the core principles, guiding concepts, practices, and theories in composition studies in *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2016). The threshold concepts in that book have not only influenced how composition faculty and students across the country understand disciplinary frameworks of academic writing, but have also shaped how faculty and students experience and engage with writing in the writing classes. When considered alongside the articulation agreements that the UC system maintains with community colleges and other accredited colleges and universities

(which determine which courses are transferrable when students transfer to UC campuses, and which thus heavily influence course design in California community colleges), these guiding principles and threshold concepts demonstrate that UC faculty have taken a lead in shaping the work of academic writing programs and instruction in higher education.

The UC system has also been the site of significant inequities when it comes to remediation and writing instruction. It has had a writing placement exam (what was formerly known as Subject A and now known as the Analytical Writing Placement Exam) and writing requirement (what is currently known as the Entry-Level Writing Requirement) for over 150 years, which have been consistently used to separate students deemed "proficient" according to the UC's standards from those who need to develop their composition skills further. Deficit assumptions about students have always accompanied the UC system's use of this placement exam (Stanley, 2010), thus making the UC an important case study because it enables compositionists to study longitudinally why the system's academic writing programs have struggled to engage students of color in effective ways. Since the first Subject A requirement was implemented at UC Berkeley in 1869, students have been "held" for remedial writing courses each semester, with as many as 50% of UC Berkeley's students being held for Subject A in the 1970s (Stanley, 2010, p. 5) and over 55% of its students in the 1980s (Stanley, 2010, p. 16). Jane Stanley (2010) meticulously documents how remediation in the UC system and at UC Berkeley in particular has long served as a rhetorical tool with which the UC can demonstrate its ability as a public institution to educate all students regardless of skill level while simultaneously using high Subject A failure rates as evidence of its high standards as an "elite" public university system. At many moments in UC Berkeley's history, students held for Subject A have disproportionately been students of color, with the class curricula and pedagogies also reflecting racial and linguistic bias. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the high numbers of Asian immigrant and Asian American students who were held for Subject A at UC Berkeley drove instructors in

the newly formed Asian Studies division to begin designing and teaching their own academic writing classes. Their efforts, alongside the efforts of members of the Afro-American Student Union to bring African American literature to writing classes, led the UC Berkeley Asian Studies division to build multiple academic writing classes that would be controlled by the Asian Studies division, taught with ethnic studies pedagogies, and situated in the study of both domestic and international social and political contexts. The division's courses were among the first on campus to challenge the racism of Subject A and to reject academic writing as purely a tool for assimilation and remediation. The division redefined academic writing as an integral part of helping students of color to build the historical, literary, linguistic, and analytical foundations they would need to solve problems in their communities. The critical analysis the division had generated to expose the racist underpinnings of Berkeley's Subject A program would later reemerge in the 1980s when Asian American students and instructors argued that the university's SANSE program reproduced racial hierarchies that disproportionately impacted Asian and Asian American students. The rich history of academic writing in UC Berkeley's Ethnic Studies department thus offers important opportunities to examine examples of student- and instructor-led resistance in response to the white supremacist ideologies that have structured its university academic writing program. As UC writing requirements and student demographics have evolved, and as the institution has moved away from remediation and towards equity and inclusion initiatives to support students of color in composition classes, the forms of resistance both within UC Berkeley's Ethnic Studies programs and within the UC system's university writing programs have changed in important ways.

Studying how and why the UC system has consistently fallen short of creating academic writing programs that empower students of color and their communities is also a deeply personal project. My work with low-income students of color within the UC system who are enrolled in academic writing classes began over fifteen years ago when I became a writing tutor

at UC Berkeley's Student Learning Center and worked with UC Berkeley's Summer Bridge program while I was an undergraduate. Although the positions I held changed over the years, by the time I left the UC, I was able to see from the perspective of a tutor, a tutoring program administrator, and a writing instructor that the work of academic writing has consistently been conceptualized administratively and pedagogically as a technical set of skills and conventions that students must master. As such, any difficulties students of color face in this process are commonly viewed as a failure on the part of the student, with little recognition that the conventions and skills themselves as well as the larger pedagogical and institutional contexts in which writing is taught are premised on the reproduction of racial inequities. While writing program administrators, tutoring centers, and writing program instructors may challenge the assumptions and values that structure the field, attempts to do so have been easily suppressed because of the precarious positions that writing instructors, tutors, staff, and even writing program administrators hold in the UC system. Yet, my work with students at UC Berkeley and UC Merced made clear to me that we must continue to fight for structural change. For eight summers, I was able to bear witness through my work with Berkeley's Summer Bridge program to what was possible when instructors made visible to students the politics of academic writing as an assimilationist project that reinforces racial and economic stratification, and when they made this the central focus of the writing curriculum and class discussions. Through APIEL NOW, I saw how students of color could build sophisticated and interdisciplinary forms of analysis in order to expose the institutional barriers to their education. These experiences confirmed that it was possible for the UC system to create spaces where academic writing could be more than skills-based work: these spaces already existed in Summer Bridge, and students like the student organizers in APIEL NOW had a long history of creating their own spaces to do this work. Why had the UC's academic writing programs, for all of their interest in empowering

students of color and in equipping them with analytical and conceptual tools, never become generative spaces for students of color in these ways?

When I began teaching writing classes at UC Merced in 2013, I saw that few of the lessons and knowledge that the other UC campuses had accumulated over the past 150 years on how to address racial inequities in writing instruction had been applied at the newest campus. UC Merced served predominately low-income students and students of color[2], and because of its original charge to serve the students and communities of the San Joaquin Valley, it presumably would lead the charge to transform education in ways that would benefit students of color. However, when I arrived at UC Merced, I discovered that there were many structural barriers, disciplinary frameworks, and ideologies in place that reinforced notions of writing as remediation, deficit models of education, and product-driven pedagogy. The difficulties that my colleagues and I faced in challenging these ideologies and structural inequities were compounded by the high percentages of incoming freshmen who were required to take UC Merced's entry-level writing course (Writing 1). While campuses like UC Berkeley managed over the years to decrease the percentage of students held for Subject A from 50% of its students to 20% by 2010 (Stanley, 2010, p. 5), UC Merced regularly holds a significant portion of its incoming students for the entry-level writing requirement. In Fall 2020 alone, for instance, UC Merced offered 75 sections of Writing 1 (UC Merced Class Schedule, 2020). Out of the 1500 open seats in these sections, 1271 seats were filled (UC Merced Class Schedule, 2020). As a point of comparison, there were 2,154 students in UC Merced's incoming freshmen class in Fall 2020 (University of California Infocenter, 2020a). UC Merced struggles with similar structural and racial problems in writing instruction that UC Berkeley had long struggled with (and in many cases, actively fostered for the institution's political benefit). This has come at the expense of the

_____

[2] 80% of the undergraduates during the 2019-2020 academic year were students of color (UC Merced Fast Facts, 2020).

students themselves, many of whom recognized during my time there that the education they were receiving was the product of systemic racism and the ongoing institutional neglect of students of color.

My study of the UC system is thus an attempt to understand how the UC system and writing programs have been able to maintain the ongoing reproduction of racial disparities when it comes to academic writing instruction, even as they embrace equity and inclusion initiatives. It is also an attempt to situate my own students' and colleagues' attempts to challenge disciplinary norms in academic writing within a longer but forgotten history of student- and instructor-led resistance with the hope that, by recovering these histories and reading about them alongside institutional and structural analysis, we will be better positioned to transform the work of academic writing.

Methodology and Data

In order to build institutional analysis that reflects the complexities of academic writing instruction in higher education and within the UC system in particular, I have approached this research from several angles. My research focuses not only on composition studies, but also connects to ethnic studies, critical university studies, and academic labor studies. I build layered contexts in order to examine the many facets of student and instructor experiences in academic writing programs, including pedagogical methods, institutional structures, labor structures, assessment practices and standards, and ideological and pedagogical conflicts with other fields of study. In doing so, I have been able to make sense of how these seemingly disparate areas intersect and are all critical for understanding why composition classes have been and continue to be sites of struggle for students and faculty of color. Researching the intersection of composition classes and academic labor is not new, but when considered in relation to the ways that learning outcomes and teaching evaluation practices are used to reproduce racial inequities

in the field, these multiple, intersecting analytical frameworks allow me to examine how the reproduction of racial hierarchies happens across multiple dimensions and contexts.

Using this multidisciplinary method has also allowed me to bring scholarship on composition studies in dialogue with reports and archival materials that document the history of the Third World Strike at UC Berkeley; the long and complex history of Subject A and remedial writing instruction in the UC Berkeley writing program; and the history of writing instruction within the African American Studies, Asian American Studies, Native American Studies, and Chicana/o and Latina/o Studies programs at Berkeley. I conducted extensive archival research for two months in the Bancroft Library at UC Berkeley as well as in the archives at the UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Library in order to construct a more complete history of writing instruction at the University of California in the 1960s and 1970s. Jane Stanley's (2010) meticulously researched history of remediation in writing instruction at the University of California draws from nearly the same archival material from the Bancroft Library that I examined, including the University of California Office of the President Records (Permanent Files 1952-1975), the Academic Senate Berkeley Division Records (1869-ongoing), Records of the Office of the Chancellor at UC Berkeley (1952-ongoing), and the Commission on Responses to a Changing Student Body (1987-1990). Yet, unlike Stanley's work, my analysis of these archival records specifically centers the histories and work of the UC Berkeley ethnic studies programs and student protesters in the Third World Liberation Front, the Afro-American Student Union, and the Asian Studies division. Although the UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies department's efforts to address racial inequities in writing instruction have been presented in published studies as largely peripheral to the decades-long efforts to address the problems with Subject A within the UC system (Stanley, 2010) or excluded altogether, my analysis of these archival records demonstrates that the Ethnic Studies department's work around writing instruction has in fact been much more extensive and important to the field of composition

than is commonly understood. Re-examining these archival materials alongside published histories and recently published reports are crucial to my analysis, allowing me to track which perspectives have been excluded from dominant narratives in composition studies and how these exclusions have shaped the trajectory both of composition studies and of academic writing in the ethnic studies programs themselves.

I supplement my archival and text-based research with interviews with current and former writing instructors and stakeholders in postsecondary colleges and universities who see writing classrooms as spaces where they and their students can work towards racial and social justice. Using purposive snowball sampling, I interviewed six participants from June 2019 through present. To preserve the anonymity of participants who requested that their names not be used, I used pseudonyms or descriptors that they had selected or approved. Other participants voluntarily asked or agreed to be referred to by their full names. Interviews were scheduled to be two hours in length, during which participants were asked to respond to several semi-structured interview questions. The semi-structured questions asked participants to reflect on how they had come to understand race and social inequities, their work with students of color in academic writing classes, the contexts they believed were critical for understanding their work with students of color, and their experiences working as a composition instructor both in their home department and in their larger institution. The interviews lasted for as little as one hour or as long as two four-hour sessions. In many cases, participants chose to share information and to explain things to me that were not necessarily responses to the questions I had prepared, but which they believed were important for me to understand about their experiences or about the larger contexts I was researching. Participants were given the option of whether they wanted their interviews recorded or not. Only two full sessions and one partial session were recorded; the rest were documented through my handwritten notes during and immediately after the interviews took place. Participants had the opportunity to engage with me

in voluntary follow-up discussions. One participant spoke with me on a regular basis in the weeks and months following their formal interview.

João Costa Vargas (2006) discusses the limitations of using handwritten notes to document and reconstruct conversations and describes that in his study, he only used dialogues "that happened more than once or that were typical of the interaction I had with different persons" (p. 34). One participant in my study made clear their concerns about the dangers of fetishizing the text of transcribed interviews and specifically requested that I refrain from quoting excessively from their interview recordings. They asked that I instead present a characterization of what they had explained — focusing more on presenting the main concepts and assertions they were making rather than focusing extensively on direct quotes that they believed would mean little (or whose meaning would be overdetermined) without the appropriate context. With the participant's permission, I used Vargas's approach for selecting which parts of my notes and recording to present and write about in this study. Following Vargas's method, I only wrote about and discussed points that the participant had discussed on multiple occasions in our conversations and follow-up discussions, and attempted to write about these points in ways that reflected typical explanations or assertions they would make. All participants, including this participant, were given the opportunity to read and comment on a draft of the chapter(s) in which I analyzed and presented their stories to ensure that my presentation and characterization of their responses and arguments were accurate.

Davydd J. Greenwood's (2008) definition of action research has also shaped my approaches for designing and deciding the scope of this study. According to Greenwood, action research is guided through collective efforts between social scientists and local stakeholders to build a project collaboratively from start to finish. Stakeholders define the problems they face and want to address. They not only contribute knowledge to the project, but also become active participants and researchers in the project. This means that stakeholders work with the

17

researcher to design the research methodology and to interpret the data while also creating new solutions and assessment processes in order to address the problems they are facing and to achieve the outcomes they set out to accomplish. According to Greenwood, action research is "built … on the belief that no one, no matter how much social science training and professional authority he or she has, is as much of an 'expert' in the lives of the local stakeholders as the stakeholders themselves" (p. 330). This forces the researcher to build shared projects with stakeholders where the primary goal is "to pursue collectively desired outcomes" (p. 330) and that will lead to what the stakeholders feel is a "meaningful approach to the problem — empirically, theoretically, methodologically" (p. 331).

Much of the foundational work that I did with stakeholders to prepare for this study began while I was still a writing lecturer in the UC system. I taught in the writing programs at UC Berkeley and UC Merced for five years, building not only institutional knowledge of how academic writing was taught and conceptualized on each campus and in each program, but also building connections and shared understandings with my colleagues through our collective academic and political work. While my prior experiences and observations as a writing lecturer were not a formal part of this study, they were critical in helping me build key insights about the politics of academic writing and writing pedagogy, and later allowed me to gain the trust of and access to study participants. While I was a lecturer, I worked closely with stakeholders, including lecturers, professors, students, and staff. At both UC Merced and UC Berkeley, my colleagues and I regularly engaged in discussions and analysis about academic writing in formal classroom settings, on program committees, and in professional development groups. As part of our formal performance review processes and our informal efforts to improve our teaching during the academic year, I observed my colleagues' classes and teaching pedagogies and was also observed by them regularly. I organized with students, staff, senate faculty, and lecturers at UC Berkeley outside of the classroom through APIEL NOW and through the many organizing

groups that formed during the protests against tuition increases and budget cuts during the 2009-2010 academic year. I attended weekly meetings, organized alongside staff and students, worked with them to develop analysis about institutional policies, attended and participated in rallies and actions, and engaged in ongoing conversations and discussions with various stakeholders as we built contexts and understandings together. Although these interactions took place years before I designed this study and no formal data was collected, my work with these groups was critical for helping me to understand not only the important contexts we needed to analyze the problems we were facing, but also how to identify and name these problems. We had to learn how to build dynamic and multidisciplinary forms of analysis that were at once flexible enough to contain and reflect the connections between widely disparate experiences within a shared institutional framework, but also precise enough to allow different stakeholders to assess the particularities of their own experiences. During my time as a lecturer, I also spent three summers working with lecturers, professors, and K-12 instructors to design curricula, to review and assess teaching practices, and to build and test new pedagogical practices and theories that we designed together. This preparatory work would shape and inform our work throughout the academic year, while also helping us to build shared contexts and ways of defining and addressing the problems we were seeing in our classes, in the university, and in the field of composition studies. The insights we came to through our collaborations and the work that we saw still needed to be done have all formed the basis of the questions and contexts that this study raises and builds, as well as the problems it tries to address.

Where this study deviates from the principles Greenwood (2008) has laid out in his definition of action research is in the degree to which early stakeholders in the project continued to be active participants and contributors to the study over time. It is important to note that the stakeholders in the project with whom I worked early on to name the problems we were facing and to construct contexts for understanding these problems were not necessarily comfortable

becoming participants in the study. Although they continue to be active interlocutors with me and have spent significant time working with me over the past four years to continue co-constructing frameworks, practices, methodologies, and analysis that work towards our shared visions for the future of academic writing and education, many chose not to participate formally in the study itself. In other cases, I had to make decisions as a researcher about the scope of the project and what was possible to accomplish within the restrictions of research that is carried out under institutional constraints. Students and staff, for example, were key collaborators who helped me build the conceptual foundations that I needed when I was a writing instructor and that would continue to inform my work as an educator and researcher. Through working with them, I came to see how their work and experiences were central to understanding the institutional restrictions that shape academic writing classes and how students of color experience these classes. In its early stages, this project was supposed to be an ethnographic study that would reflect the experiences and work of students, staff, and faculty. Yet, receiving IRB approval to interview students and to work with students in writing classrooms would have required receiving permission both from the IRB office at the research sites and from the department chairs of the departments in which I planned to conduct ethnographies. Given the politics of my project and the precarity of their employment situations, several prospective participants felt at the time that participating in such a study with these IRB restrictions would put them in vulnerable positions and make it difficult to preserve their anonymity. I thus made the decision to focus my study on instructors and to invite only instructors to participate in the study to minimize this risk. This has given me the opportunity to focus on highlighting the perspectives and stories of the contingent faculty whose visions and ways of working with their students in academic writing classrooms are rarely acknowledged in the mainstream composition publications. Yet, this also has meant that there is much missing from this study, including the

voices and perspectives of students and staff, analysis of student work, and data from classroom interactions.

Throughout this study, I engage in careful analysis and critique of several methods, theories, and practices in the field that have commonly been used to promote equity and inclusion in academic writing classrooms, including threshold concepts, labor-based grading contracts, program and course learning outcomes, and mastery over grammatical concepts. My archival research, interviews with participants, prior experiences as a writing lecturer in the UC system, and ongoing working relationships with stakeholders have all allowed me to build the foundational contexts and multidisciplinary forms of analysis that inform my assessments and critiques of existing disciplinary frameworks and pedagogical methods in the field of writing studies. Throughout this study, I analyze dominant frameworks and methods in order to explain what they offer to the field, how they work, and why these approaches often fail to serve multilingual students and students of color even when they are widely seen as tools that can be used to challenge structural and racial inequities in academic writing. These critiques and assessments offer insight into the critical and analytical work that my colleagues and I have engaged in regularly over the years in order to define and address the structural problems we see in the university, in the field of composition studies, and in the policies that shape our work with students in the writing classroom.

Organization of the Chapters

This study examines academic writing programs' efforts to serve students of color using interdisciplinary approaches. I examine the political, economic, ideological, pedagogical, and experiential dimensions of academic writing in higher education. I alternate between offering historical and structural analysis and case studies to demonstrate how institutional priorities and processes are experienced at the level of the individual instructor over the span of their careers.

Chapter 1 examines how diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives in contemporary universities have failed to meet the needs of students of color in writing departments. The chapter begins by reviewing the shift to multiculturalism and the institutionalization of Ethnic Studies programs, showing how the focus on multiculturalism in particular has contributed to the kinds of diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives we see today in higher education. The chapter then looks at the University of California writing programs to analyze why UC equity initiatives, which are structured around learning outcomes and the notion of institutional excellence, fail to address the politics of remediation and disciplinary practices in the composition field that maintain racial hierarchies. I reassess key approaches in university writing classes that are now widely perceived as useful tools for addressing the needs of students of color, including threshold concepts and labor-based grading contracts, and show how these tools preserve racial inequities and colorblind disciplinary frameworks and methodologies.

Chapter 2 examines the overlooked history of how students and faculty of color in university writing classes have fought to redefine the work of academic writing in higher education. The chapter begins by reviewing how the composition field has repeatedly rewritten or suppressed the demands and visions of students and faculty of color. Drawing on Carmen Kynard's and Min-Zhan Lu's critical analyses of Mina Shaughnessy's work, the first part of this chapter illustrates how Mina Shaughnessy's framing of grammar as a form of access and empowerment rewrote CCNY students' demands for a relevant education and reinforced the field's disinterest in realizing the full potential of the 1974 *Students' Right To Their Own Language* resolution, which sought to redefine black student literacy and language. The second part of the chapter examines how African American and Asian American students at UC Berkeley fought to establish and control their own writing classes in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It recovers the largely forgotten history of the fights led by both students and faculty of color at UC Berkeley to design writing classes that would not only serve the needs of their students and position them

22

to serve their communities, but that would also challenge the racist practices used in the university writing program.

Chapter 3 examines how postsecondary writing instructors challenge the disciplinary practices that disenfranchise students of color. I use two case studies of writing instructors in higher education to examine how these instructors have built different understandings of what it means to work with students of color and how they have developed new pedagogies and methodologies that directly challenge traditional diversity, equity, and inclusion frameworks. These writing instructors reject the assumption that individual advancement within the academy as currently structured is evidence of equitable progress for students of color. Instead, they situate their work, learning, and the production of knowledge within the political, racial, and economic inequities that shape their students' lived experiences both within and outside of the academy. This chapter reveals how these instructors resist the many ideological and administrative restrictions that their home departments and the composition field impose and illustrates how they have redesigned their conceptual and methodological frameworks to center their students.

Chapter 4 examines the tense history between writing program administrators, tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure track writing instructors, which are critical for understanding the significant challenges that composition instructors face as they attempt to challenge racial power structures in writing programs. This history also provides relevant context for understanding why calls for writing program administrators to lead structural change in writing programs have historically failed. I examine how the logics of neoliberalism and economic efficiency have created stratified labor structures in university writing programs that undermine contingent writing instructors' attempts to redefine the terms of their working conditions and compensation structures. I then analyze how the tensions between managerial and faculty interests within the University of California affect faculty of color as they try to support

students of color in entry-level writing classes. I look specifically at the teaching excellence and merit review processes within the UC system for lecturers and analyze how these excellence review procedures and labor structures reproduce managerial interests at the expense of both faculty and students of color. This chapter shows how the contingent labor structures and excellence review procedures in writing programs work at cross purposes with the innovative pedagogies that writing instructors may be trying to build for students of color in their classes.

Chapter 5 circles back to writing instruction in Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies programs in order to document the largely overlooked contributions they have made to writing instruction. This chapter examines how the Asian American Studies program at UC Berkeley and the Asian American Studies department and College of Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State University (SFSU) have reenvisioned academic writing from the voices, perspectives, and experiences of students and communities of color. I first look at the contributions the Asian American Studies writing classes at UC Berkeley made in the 1980s, which were largely criticized or overlooked by Berkeley's university writing program for years. I then look at the teaching practices of two Ethnic Studies writing instructors at UC Berkeley and SFSU to understand how they have invested in the knowledge, experiences, and actions of their students in order to build classes where students will see writing as something meaningful in their lives. This chapter demonstrates what is possible if traditional writing programs were to work with ethnic studies writing classes to reconceptualize the politics of academic writing so that students can use it to works towards personal and community empowerment.

Chapter One: Program Learning Outcomes and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives: Hidden Tools for Reinforcing Racial Inequities in Academic Writing Programs

The ongoing difficulties that the field of composition studies has faced in serving students of color cannot be understood apart from the history of ethnic studies departments in higher education. While it is easy to locate the source of the problem in university writing programs' failure to embrace fully the ideologies, curriculum, and politics of ethnic studies programs, doing so fails to acknowledge that ethnic studies programs themselves were deliberately designed to be reformist in nature. As such, composition instructors' insistence on offering instructional interventions that promote integration into dominant literacy structures is not necessarily at odds with the strategic forms of institutionalization and subordinated inclusion that university administrators and the philanthropic organizations that funded ethnic studies programs wanted these programs to reproduce.

The ongoing appeal in English and composition programs of using academic writing to reproduce disciplinary and institutional norms must be understood in the context of the institutionalization of ethnic studies programs themselves. Although the student activists who led the movements for black studies and ethnic studies demanded programs that would help students to transform society, many of the early blacks studies programs were originally funded by philanthropic organizations that sought both to quell the more radical elements of students' demands for social and educational revolution and to reshape them to align with institutional reform. The Ford Foundation in particular, which Robert Allen (1990) describes as "the most important, though least publicized, organization manipulating the militant black movement" (p. 73) in the 1960s, used their philanthropic activities to build a black elite and middle class that would reproduce the values and interests of the existing power structure by suppressing the demands, protests, and radical action of the black movement. With its interest in maintaining

social stability, building a foundation for capitalist development within black communities, and strategically creating divisions between groups that could have collectively built the critical alliances necessary for real community-based control over schools and resources (p. 150-151), the foundation was able to use its philanthropy to "channel and control the black liberation movement and forestall future urban revolts" (p. 73). The foundation's rationale for financing several of the early African American Studies programs in higher education, which amounted to over one million dollars across fourteen colleges in 1969 (Biondi, 2012), was no different. The foundation, for instance, granted $184,000 in 1969 to finance Yale's Afro-American Studies program, which was described by the foundation program officer John Scanlon as the "yardstick" by which he believed that all African American Studies programs in which the foundation had invested money should be measured (as quoted in Mitchell, 2011, p. 100). According to Mitchell (2011), the foundation's decision to fund and point to Yale's Afro-American Studies program as a model not only indicated its support for Yale's program structure, but also suggested that the foundation supported "the tactics that Yale's Black Student Association had employed to reach it — working in tandem with administrators and faculty, protesting through the institutional protocols — rather than the more militant tactics — building occupations and student strikes, even bombing university infrastructure — that students had begun to adopt across the country" (p. 100). The foundation's philanthropic efforts, in effect, were not simply a matter of providing economic support to start and sustain these programs. They were fundamentally tied to using black studies to *reduce* the perceived threat that black studies, the black movement, and students' most militant demands and actions posed both to the existing social order and to the university. By supporting the launch of programs that went through typical institutional channels and that would prove themselves willing to work with and to align ideologically with those in positions of power, the foundation could strategically move black studies programs and scholars in the direction of established academic programs

and, in turn, suppress the political visions of revolutionary social change that black communities and the black movement were demanding and ready to bring into being. Its financial support for an integrationist model of black studies primarily benefitted white students who would be able to learn about black experiences, but came at the expense of the student movements whose commitments to Black Power ideologies posed a threat to the organizational and ideological structure of the university (Rooks, 2006). As Noliwe Rooks (2006) notes, "the Ford Foundation helped to craft a rationale for Black Studies that allowed most universities to retain much of what they believed to be inviolate in terms of their organization and autonomy, while simultaneously responding to requests for change coming from within and outside of the university proper … It mattered little that the result looked markedly different from the programs many Black students imagined. Nor did it matter that the new strategy appeared to center on the racial education of white students" (p. 22-23).

As black studies and ethnic studies programs began to form, the student founders and movement leaders found themselves increasingly at odds with faculty and administrators. Unlike the movement leaders who had pushed for politicized programs that would transform society and create material change in their communities, faculty and administrators seemed to be more invested in creating classes that would facilitate racial integration within the existing academic and social structures than in creating the structural change. The perceived disconnect between "talking about problems instead of being out there solving them" (Biondi, 2012, p. 204) became a major source of tension within these programs as the student founders and professors debated over the viability of the political, ideological, and activist mission of black studies and ethnic studies within the constraints of academic systems designed to maintain the existing social order. Reginald Wilson perhaps put it best when he argued that recovering the histories of communities of color and developing a culturally relevant education were both "'fine *and necessary, but they are not enough*'" (Wilson, as quoted in Biondi, 2012, p. 204, emphasis added). In

his view, what was needed was "'the revolutionizing of the American educational experience'" so that education could be "'the center for community action and a resource for effecting social change'" (Wilson, as quoted in Biondi, 2012, p. 204). As the student activist founders of black studies and ethnic studies programs fought to realize the political and activist projects that they had envisioned, however, the difficulties of standing up to university administrators became readily apparent. University administrators had significant power and resources and, moreover, supported and stood to benefit from endorsing the ideological mission underlying the early financing of many ethnic studies programs. L. Ling-chi Wang (2019) describes the ongoing clashes between the UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Department and the UC Berkeley administration in the early years of the department as "inevitable, frequent, and intense" as the university sought to "steadily erode the TWLF principles … in order to bring them into full compliance with university norms and values and assimilate them into the academic mainstream" (p. 101). African American Studies faculty at Berkeley, for instance, split from the Berkeley Ethnic Studies Department in December 1973 after the first external review of the department in order to give the African American Studies program "intellectual legitimacy" and "credibility" (Wang, 2019, p. 102). This move was facilitated by Chancellor Albert Bowker and led faculty and students still committed to the founding principles and political project of Ethnic Studies to boycott African American Studies classes for two years. As Berkeley's Ethnic Studies department fought to survive over the next several years, it became increasingly institutionalized as the reform measures it began to adopt in order to ensure its survival ultimately led to the concession of many of its original principles, including its political commitment to serving and being accountable to the communities themselves.

At once relegated to the peripheries of universities as programs whose founding principles did not align with the university's mission while simultaneously forced to conform to university regulations and reform-based models of education, ethnic studies programs struggled

to realize the promise and visions of their political projects. They were thus never positioned to influence the broader work or politics of other disciplines, fields, and departments. Elaine Kim recalls that for ten years, the other departments at UC Berkeley ignored the Ethnic Studies programs (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020) as the young department struggled to protect its original mission and increasingly found itself forced to align with established university policies and procedures in order to survive. The pervasive assumption among departments was that the ethnic studies programs at Berkeley would eventually "atrophy on the vine" (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). Its political work and visions and its relevance for other fields, including English and composition, were never taken seriously or viewed by other departments as critical to their own work. As ethnic studies programs were left to their own devices and forced to follow university regulations, other departments could continue to ignore the Ethnic Studies department's work around racial and economic justice and transformative pedagogies. English and composition programs, for example, turned to literary multiculturalism as a way to introduce students to the histories and experiences of communities of color while conveniently bypassing the original visions of social revolution and material change in communities that had animated both the student movements for ethnic studies and the militancy with which they fought to transform the work and mission of education. From the outset, then, ethnic studies programs were never called upon or given the resources to drive the kind of structural, ideological, or political change in the university that could have forced other departments to recognize how their own disciplinary practices reproduced racial and economic inequities. Instead, the Ford Foundation and university administrators deliberately positioned black studies and ethnic studies to be peripheral programs that would contribute primarily to the racial education of white students (Rooks, 2006). The early positioning of ethnic studies as a reformist project prefigured and in fact lay the foundation for the eventual rise of both literary multiculturalism in English and writing classes as well as later diversity initiatives that would

maintain racial hierarchies and systematically disinvest in communities of color despite the outward appearance of inclusion and cross-racial solidarity.

Literature and composition programs introduced multicultural literature and personal narratives into literature and composition courses in the 1980s in order to address the long history of racism in university writing and English programs and to acknowledge the persistent challenges they faced in engaging students of color. Yet, their decision to do so problematically relied on the logics of liberal multiculturalism, which saw diversity and inclusion as issues of *representation and replicability* — issues that could be "solved" simply by including more token articles and books written by minority writers and about minority communities into course curricula. This approach located the production of knowledge about diversity as necessary so that select students who were privileged enough to attend the university could advance in society, but in doing so, it strategically ignored the unchanged realities of the masses outside of academia. Within this framework, the university could rewrite student movement demands so that instead of transforming universities to work towards the liberation of working class communities of color, the multicultural curricula deployed in literature and writing classes could instead facilitate the seamless dehistoricization and depoliticization of the social, economic, and political struggles of communities of color. By foregrounding *the study of and production of knowledge about* these communities' experiences, the university could thus avoid altogether the real steps needed to change the ongoing material and structural inequities communities of color faced both in and outside of the university (Melamed, 2011; Palumbo-Liu, 1995). Writing and literature programs commonly relied on course readings to represent the voices of marginalized communities, but did not necessarily address the structural mechanisms by which most underrepresented students and communities continued to be denied equitable access to resources and opportunities even if they were reading and writing about a multicultural curriculum. These programs also failed to make visible the fact that having students of color

read multicultural literature within the university did not lead to significant material change for communities of color outside of the academy. As Melamed (2011) argues, by introducing multicultural literature as a tool for diversification and inclusion, the university played a critical role in building an elite professional-managerial class of workers skilled in the rhetoric and literary study of diversity and inclusion. Their accumulation of knowledge as multicultural subjects promised individual advancement within a largely untouched liberal multicultural framework but with few prospects of liberation for the masses.

The inclusion of multicultural literature and narrative writing brought ideas of integration, cultural recognition, and representation into writing and literature programs — what Melamed (2011) calls, in reference to James Kyung-Jin Lee's (2004) work, a "strategy for racial abandonment" (Melamed, 2011, p. 97). This strategy offered a presumed vehicle through which to understand and work against racism but instead turned attention away from and thus helped to facilitate the ongoing inequitable distribution of economic resources and the implementation of racist policies in the real world. As Lee's (2004) work makes clear, fictional visions of cross-racial solidarities and cross-racial interactions presented within multicultural works written in the 1980s were supposed to demonstrate presumably new configurations and models of social relations. Instead, they reflected the problematic legacies of racial power structures that persisted in the real world. According to Lee, fictionalized representations of multicultural spaces were not necessarily successful in imagining viable solutions to the systemic inequities and the uneven distribution of resources along racial lines. Lee's analysis of literary works such as Hisaye Yamamoto's "A Fire in Fontana" and Alejandro Morales's *The Brick People*, for instance, reveals that the material advances of communities of color represented in these multicultural literary structures were problematically contingent on leaving the structural foundations of whiteness and white supremacy unthreatened. This was particularly true in cases where characters of color who expressed cross-racial solidarity did so only by assuming the logics and class positions of

whiteness that not only silenced the very communities of color whom they were presumably expressing solidarity with, but which also allowed them to participate in the forms of racial distancing and abandonment they believed they were challenging. Lee points out, for instance, that Asian American characters in Yamamoto's text could express cross-racial solidarity for black communities from the comfort of both physical distance and the protection of their strategic alignment with whiteness, but their individually expressed rhetorical solidarity never materialized into practiced solidarity or actions. Characters regularly demonstrated shifts in individual consciousness, but never worked towards collective and community-based transformation with evidence of material change. Lee illustrates that while individual characters in these multicultural works regularly presented alternative ways of reading contexts that both exposed the ideological constraints of social narratives and offered new analysis, these moments of possibility were short-lived as the texts' narrative arcs regularly subsumed these possibilities back into the racialized social structures and norms they were meant to challenge. In this sense, Lee's work speaks to the problems with the pervasive belief in literature and writing courses that multicultural literature could serve as a proxy for structural change: the failures of literary representation illustrate the immense difficulties of imagining new social relations and ways of representing race and racism in ways that are capable of driving the kind of material change that challenge both the limits of the individual-as-activist and the restrictions of ideological and structural norms in literary representation and embodied action.

As shown by Lee (2004) and Melamed (2011), the failures of multicultural literature in the 1980s as a vehicle for social and structural change thus operated on two levels: in the spaces between classroom and community, and in the spaces between literary representation and learned practice. At the first level, literature and writing programs' efforts to produce students who would inspire change through their acquired knowledge about racism and social difference within a liberal-multicultural framework became an excuse to overlook the practices that

32

systematically excluded and subordinated communities of color outside of academia. Classroom instruction and literary study thus became critical sites of multicultural socialization: by producing multicultural subjects and equipping them with the presumed knowledge they would need to work in racially sensitive ways once leaving the academy, it became possible for universities to argue that shaping students' critical consciousness about race was the only work needed to fight racism. Multicultural subjects' ability to advance within the existing social structure was used to justify the ongoing disinvestment in the social programs and resources that were critical for opening opportunities for communities excluded from the academy (Melamed, 2011). Because of the presumed benefits and future potential for social change that multicultural study promised to individual students, it became a tool that could be used to justify the uneven distribution of economic and social resources and opportunities to the masses. Yet, the literature itself that students were reading simultaneously failed to provide viable models for building the kinds of racial engagement, solidarity, or economic alternatives in society that they professed to. Instead, these works provided examples of *rhetorical* solidarity that were premised on characters' ability to profess racial solidarity or alternative possibilities for social relations only when in safe proximity to whiteness or when they located themselves within the prevailing ideological and structural norms (Lee, 2004). As Lee (2004) puts it, the fictions of multicultural narratives "teach us how to abandon people even as they cling to hopes that this might not come to pass" (p. xxviii). These narratives thus easily became pedagogical tools that at once offered the promise of social transformation and glimpses of resistance and liberation while training unsuspecting readers in the art of maintaining racial hierarchies, subordination, and systematic disinvestment under the guise of inclusivity and cross-racial solidarity. Because they failed to offer examples of social resistance that actually worked to transform the uneven distribution of economic resources along racial lines, multicultural narratives instead became models for how students could, by subscribing to the seeming promises of rhetorical cross-racial solidarity and personal

33

advancement within a multicultural framework, reinforce the racial hierarchies underlying the

existing social order and distance themselves from the unchanging material and economic

realities of the masses.[1]

Although literature and composition classes widely adopted this model of education and

trained students to study literary representations of rhetorical cross-racial solidarity, this

approach did not solve the ongoing problems campuses continued to face around the inclusion,

representation, and success of underrepresented students of color (Patton et al., 2019). In an

effort to build a more welcoming campus environment for their students of color that offered a

diverse curriculum and inclusive education, universities began to focus on developing formal

diversity, equity, and inclusion requirements and initiatives modeled after multicultural education.

This time, however, the initiatives were driven and implemented primarily by university

administrators. These initiatives were designed to build the programming and infrastructure

needed to support underrepresented student populations and students of color in particular, but

were still fundamentally tied to the idea of diversity as numerical representation and as

heightened awareness *about* diverse student populations. As diversity and equity initiatives such as

minority recruitment plans, racial and cultural awareness workshops, and diversity programming

---

[1] It is also useful to consider the failures of multicultural literature in the context of its representations (or lack thereof) of racial grief and melancholy. Anne Anlin Cheng (2001) argues in *The Melancholy of Race* that one of the weaknesses in literary studies of racial formation, social transformation, and political change is that they rarely focus on "discussions of all the immaterial, pressing, unquantifiable elements that go into the making of 'reality'" (p. 25), including the study of racial oppression as it connects to melancholy. Cheng writes that understandings of the kind of racial melancholia that both people of color and raced subjects in literature experience "must extend beyond a superficial or merely affective description of sadness to a deep sense of how that sadness … conditions life for the disenfranchised and, indeed, constitutes their identity and shapes their subjectivity" (p. 23-24). Drawing on the work of Saidiya Hartman, who argues that common distinctions between emotions "no longer provide productive measures of analysis" (Cheng, 2001, p. 21) in the context of the brutality of slavery, Cheng argues that Western culture has romanticized and simplified racial melancholy: literary representations either refuse to acknowledge racial grief altogether or pare its representation down to reductive definitions and binaries that both Hartman and Cheng argue obscure the different ways that people of color turn racial melancholy and sorrow into a form of survival and agency. As Cheng writes, the extreme nature of racial oppression means that what counts as "survival and management of grief exceed our vernacular understanding of agency, of what it means to take control of oneself and one's surroundings" (p. 21). Yet, literature regularly reduces this to simplistic forms of representation structured by dominant definitions of emotion that commonly associate melancholy and sorrow with a lack of power and agency.

proliferated on university campuses (Patton et al., 2019), it became clear that these largely isolated efforts were rarely united under a coherent conceptual framework or shared visions both on a campus and national level (Milem, Chang and Antonio, 2005). This led to poorly coordinated efforts that precluded what university administrators felt could be more widespread structural change in higher education (Milem, Chang and Antonio, 2005). These gaps in comprehensive reform led universities to launch new strategies to increase the success of their equity initiatives. They now tied these strategies to market logics and adopted management techniques designed to maximize the efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity of the diversity efforts on a large scale. To ensure that all standards, performance indicators, and targets would be measured and evaluated effectively and efficiently, universities began to create a managerial class — chief diversity officers (Wilson, 2013) — who would oversee efforts to achieve institutional excellence in diversity. Among their responsibilities was the creation of campus racial climate frameworks (Fries-Britt et al., 2011; Hurtado, Milem & Calyton-Pedersen, 1998; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen & Allen, 1999; Milem, Dey & White, 2004; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005), which were designed to assess and coordinate responses to the multiple institutional and external policies and practices that shaped minority student, staff, and faculty experiences on their campuses. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), for instance, developed a new initiative, Making Excellence Inclusive, whose charge was to determine how to integrate isolated diversity initiatives with efforts to build and maintain institutional excellence. Under the argument that this simultaneous focus on institutional quality and inclusion could lay the foundation for a larger movement in higher education that would eliminate the structural barriers to academic success for underrepresented student populations, AACU commissioned a series of studies that reframed diversity as a process for improving learning (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). It argued that diversity efforts would repeatedly fail to result in structural change if university administrators were unable to determine systematically

which measures were effective and ineffective for historically underrepresented students (Bauman et al., 2005). The studies thus set forth a framework and assessment criteria for organizational change that was designed to help universities "*systematically leverage diversity for student learning and institutional excellence*" (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005, p. v; Williams, Berger & McClendon, 2005). By creating common standards, performance indicators, and targets, AACU could ostensibly coordinate what had thus far been a series of disjointed efforts and unite them under a common local and national framework. These efforts to standardize through measurement and evaluation would thus create the conditions necessary to "make excellence inclusive" (Milem, Change & Antonio, 2005, p. v). With this strategic framework in place and with the appointment of chief diversity officers who would oversee strategic equity planning efforts and design the corresponding infrastructure at the curricular, structural, and representational levels, university administrators believed their institutions would be better equipped to respond to students' felt sense of racism on campus. They could begin working towards the kinds of structural transformations that multicultural literary study alone was incapable of realizing.

Like multicultural literary education, the recommendations and extensive infrastructure set forth by Making Excellence Inclusive and similar equity and inclusion initiatives in higher education must be considered with caution. These types of initiatives and the corresponding conceptual frameworks that their administrative management teams have generated to address racial inequities in higher education rightly recognize the impossibility of assuming that the additive effects of isolated equity efforts across different departments will lead to any kind of coherent change. Their guidelines for engaging diversity on campus, including recommendations to increase minority student retention and success and to develop learning outcomes that address diversity and equity in major fields of study, are critical components of any work towards racial equity in academia. Yet, these recommendations, which are largely grounded in

efficiency- and assessment-driven models of education, seem to overlook universities' underlying interests in using these efforts to create and maintain standards of excellence that primarily benefit those already within the university and that reinforce the legitimacy of established institutional policies and practices. Milem, Chang, and Antonio (2005), for instance, tellingly note that Making Excellence Inclusive's major contribution to higher education is not the specific guidelines they give universities to promote equity through equity programming, but rather the way that these guidelines are designed to "*systematically leverage diversity for student learning and institutional excellence*" (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005, p. v; Williams, Berger & McClendon, 2005). This interest in leveraging equity infrastructures and racial climate frameworks for the benefit of the institutions themselves is reminiscent of universities' strategic investments in and use of the newly formed ethnic studies and black studies programs as tools for enhancing the racial education of white students while deliberately suppressing the more militant demands of the students of color themselves. Universities strategically position diversity initiatives in relation to (and as critical for building) the university's institutional strengths; yet, this ongoing investment in institutional excellence often comes at the expense of more radical proposals for structural transformation that would more effectively support the learning needs and experiences of students of color. As such, in the context of large-scale equity and inclusion initiatives, equity is often not conceptualized with the intent of effecting social and material change both inside and outside of the university for students and communities of color. Rather, in the neoliberal university, it is viewed as a tool to be strategically used in service of the larger administrative and the managerial goal of reinforcing and maintaining established institutional ideologies and excellence.

This chapter examines the current and increasing use of diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives on university campuses and exposes the contradictions in administrators' insistence that these initiatives offer effective ways to attend to the needs of students and communities of

color while preserving and strengthening institutional excellence. It argues that diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives' failures to reimagine institutional and disciplinary practices are due in part to the administrative and pedagogical push to tether equity efforts to the neoliberal concept of institutional excellence: by refusing to dismantle both the disciplinary practices and administrative and operational procedures presumably associated with excellence, universities preserve the very forms of race-based exclusion and the inequitable distribution of resources along racial lines that they claim to be challenging. Taking the University of California (UC) writing programs and the UC Merced Karen Merritt Writing Program in particular as a case study, this chapter examines the approaches university writing programs use to build what they believe are more equitable and inclusive practices into their coursework and curricula. I argue that, as currently conceived and implemented, composition equity and inclusion initiatives at the department and disciplinary levels regularly fail to identify the real practices and ideologies in their discipline that continue to maintain racial hierarchies, even when they have presumably decolonized their curricula and pedagogies. This chapter looks specifically at the putatively neutral and universally beneficial program and course learning outcomes that structure composition instruction and course design within the UC system and maintains that these learning outcomes and the disciplinary practices they encompass are a consistently overlooked source of racial subordination. I examine how, in their eagerness to build equity and inclusion initiatives that are additive in nature and universally applicable to all students, the UC writing programs persistently ignore both the underlying assumptions and epistemologies that structure their learning outcomes as well as the processes by which researchers and instructors in positions of power continue to maintain control over assessment practices and disciplinary ideologies with racially disparate impacts on students of color. By exposing how these learning outcomes are designed to silence any voices, experiences, and populations whose ways of constructing knowledge fail to align with the discipline's underlying premises and methodologies,

this chapter shows how the ongoing maintenance of the learning outcomes' supposedly race-neutral frameworks reproduce the discipline's racial power structures and conventions at the expense of students of color and structural transformation. I reassess key approaches in writing studies that are now widely perceived as useful equity tools for advancing support for and addressing the needs of students of color, including threshold concepts[2] and labor-based grading contracts.[3] I demonstrate that these concepts and practices continue to be invested in reproducing traditional processes, conventions, and power structures in writing studies that have historically excluded students of color. Current approaches for building diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives in writing programs work alongside and preserve traditional learning outcomes and disciplinary practices, resulting in minor curricular changes and procedural adjustments that rarely disrupt the underlying conceptual frameworks and ideologies that structure writing programs and writing studies. Yet, these approaches continue to cement the perception that colorblind learning outcomes and process-based assessment methods structured in dominance are fundamentally antiracist practices that, once coupled with culturally relevant pedagogies and equity initiatives, will lead to more equitable outcomes. This chapter seeks to expose the processes by which the imagined benefits of academic diversity and equity frameworks continue to accrue only to those already in academia and to the university itself. Like multicultural literature and literary representation, they leave unchanged the political, economic, and social foundations of society that systematically exclude the masses from equitable life opportunities in society.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives at the University of California

---

[2] Threshold concepts are the concepts, practices, and ways of thinking about writing that compositionists see as critical for the study and work of their discipline and writing instruction (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015).

[3] Labor-based grading contracts are the practice of grading students on the amount of labor they do for a class in order to move away from normative, racially based standards of assessment that reproduce dominant discourses and racial inequities (Inoue, 2019).

At the University of California (UC), the discourse of diversity, equity, and inclusion now circulates widely as evidence of the multi-campus system's expressed commitment to support the advancement of historically underrepresented student, staff, and faculty populations. The University of California's Policy on Diversity (University of California Assembly of the Academic Senate, 2020) states that the UC system sees diversity as a critical part of "the full realization of its historic promise to recognize and nurture merit, talent, and achievement" and argues that the system's ongoing excellence, academic mission, and culture of innovation depends on the multiple worldviews that emerge when individuals from different racial, ethnic, linguistic, socioeconomic, gender, religious, and geographic backgrounds have the opportunity to contribute to the life of the university. In order to remove the barriers that have historically prevented underrepresented and excluded populations from entering and participating in the university system, the UC has undertaken efforts at each of its campuses to enhance diversity and inclusivity in service of academic excellence by establishing equity and inclusion initiatives at each of its campuses. These resources have taken the form of advisory councils, academic senate committees, research centers, affinity networks and associations, equity advisors, diversity achievement awards, and more. All of these efforts are meant to support the ongoing academic and professional growth of students, staff, and faculty and their ability to access, contribute to, and advance within a diverse university structure. Under the guidance of UC Berkeley Chancellor Robert Birgeneau, for instance, UC Berkeley created the Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative so the campus could establish itself as a leader in the production of published research on diversity. It subsequently established the newly formed Division of Equity & Inclusion, which was responsible for creating a ten year strategic plan for equity, diversity, and inclusion in 2009 in order to build what the division called a "pathway to excellence" by 2020 (UC Berkeley Division of Equity and Inclusion, 2009, p. 12). The division's three-pronged approach was

designed to enhance access, opportunity, and advancement within the university by increasing

the university's contributions to research, teaching, and public service about equity, diversity and

inclusion; developing more effective pipelines for students, staff, and faculty to advance in their

academic and professional careers; and building a welcoming campus climate for all populations.

The strategies outlined in their strategic plan were expected to result in the achievement of six

key milestones by 2020 that would signal Berkeley's success in becoming an "equitable and

inclusive academy of the highest caliber — a university that honors the rich tapestry of diversity

in California, upholds a renewed commitment to Californians of every background and

perspective, and creates new fields of inquiry, knowledge, and exploration, with global reach and

implications" (p. 3). Once it achieved these milestones, Berkeley would become a model for

other academic institutions looking to equip their campuses with the appropriate resources and

infrastructure so they, too, could practice diversity as equity, inclusion, and excellence rather than

as numerical representation. The division claimed that, unlike earlier diversity initiatives which

offered focused support for specific groups on the Berkeley campus, the 10-year plan would lead

to structural transformation by targeting the growth and experience of all individuals both in

and not yet a part of the university.

For all of the rhetoric and claims about the move away from tokenism and

representation, however, UC Berkeley's strategic plan for the pathway to excellence has never

fully been able to break from the constraining logics of diversity as numerical representation in

both vision and practice. The six key milestones the division outlined in its strategic plan as

evidence of its achievements in equity and that it committed to reaching by 2020 included the

following indicators:

- The number of papers and citations of UC Berkeley faculty and researchers on equity, inclusion, and diversity measurably increases. (2012-2013)

- A significant reduction in bias-related complaints is reported by campus compliance offices. (2013-2014)

- There is a reduction in intergroup disparities in graduation rates for the entering freshman and doctoral student cohorts of Fall 2019. (2016-2017)

- Intergroup disparities in the composition of UC Berkeley staff managers and executives (both career and academic non-faculty) are greatly reduced or eliminated. (2018-2019).

- Intergroup disparities in the advancement rates of UC Berkeley faculty are greatly reduced or eliminated by discipline/field. (2016-2017)

- $10 million in extramural funding for equity and inclusion initiatives is raised with support from the upper administration. (2011-2012) (UC Berkeley Division of Equity and Inclusion, 2009, p. 10)

Most of these milestones track Berkeley's advances in supporting access, retention, and advancement for all as a matter of increasing countable outcomes: Berkeley's strength in research on equity and inclusion is measured by the number of papers produced and cited, while its ability to foster an inclusive and supportive campus climate is determined by a decline in the number of complaints. Equity between the staff and administrators and within the campus's faculty is measured based on racial and ethnic composition and advancement rates, while the amount of money raised to fund and incentivize additional diversity initiatives is presumed to be an indicator of the campus's ongoing success in its diversity, equity, and inclusion contributions to research, teaching, and service. These quantitative indicators of success, however, do not necessarily move beyond the logics of an additive approach: the university simply *adds more programming* and *produces more products* to benefit everyone without having to look at how population-based racial discrimination and oppression can continue both in and outside of the university even when the university has succeeded in meeting its target performance indicators. Reductions in numerical disparities in the composition of its student, staff, faculty, and executive administrator makeup do not necessarily mean that the university has had to make any substantive structural or ideological changes. Particularly telling is the division's insistence on tying equity and inclusion initiatives to Berkeley's ambitions of "embody[ing] excellence." The

division illustrates this conceptual framework through the image of an equilateral triangle — the symbolic core of the strategic plan's conceptual framework — with each side of the triangle labeled with the words "equity" and "inclusion." "Excellence" is positioned as the triangle's base. The strategic plan thus positions university excellence, which is achieved through what the division calls "responsive research, teaching, and public service" (p. 5), as the plan's foundation and ultimate goal. Equity (achieved through "expanded pathways for access and success") and inclusion (achieved through fostering an "engaging and healthy campus climate"), on the other hand, are presented only as the principles that will help "cement UC Berkeley's excellence and continue to position it as the preeminent public university in the world" (p. 5). They are not necessarily regarded as important ends in their own right. While the division's plan builds a supportive campus climate through inclusion and creates pathways for access and success through equity, the real objective, as indicated even in the subtitle of the strategic plan itself, is to create a "pathway to excellence" within the existing academic system — a system that equates excellence with changes in the amount of research produced and the number of underrepresented individuals who are able to advance their career paths at Berkeley. This objective, however, does not fundamentally *reimagine* the function or mission of the university, nor does it probe the ways that racism and the subordination of historically underrepresented populations can still persist both within and outside of the university even if Berkeley spends $10 million to ensure disparities in graduation rates between different racial and ethnic groups on campus disappear. The fixation on excellence, in other words, assumes that racial power structures and hierarchies can be addressed and remedied as long as everyone has equal access to and equitable opportunities to obtain *individually and for themselves* the coveted outcomes and products of the university (a diploma, publications, a path to an administrative or executive position, tenure).

43

Yet, the focus on excellence fails to consider that equitable and racially just outcomes may require abandoning short-sighted and invariably individualistic understandings of what count as desirable outcomes within academia's current structure. Equity instead requires using different priorities and processes to reconceptualize the kinds of social relationships, processes, and institutions that matter to the masses outside of the academy. This type of approach would necessitate a radical reenvisioning of the kinds of relationships and ways of constructing knowledge that are critical for social and racial justice for communities but that are often antithetical to the push to maintain institutional academic excellence as it is currently conceptualized. The use of academic equity and inclusion efforts as tools for reinforcing the importance of the university and to build its capacity for excellence thus comes at the expense of deep social and structural transformation. In UC Berkeley's bid to consolidate its hold over institutional excellence and to reestablish itself as a leader in public higher education under the banner of diversity, equity, and inclusion, it subscribes to the notion that its future as an excellent institution depends on simply *removing* the barriers to success for underrepresented populations within its campus so they can more easily be incorporated into the *existing* structure. In doing so, it fails to recognize that because the current system and its accompanying practices will continue to exclude on the basis of race and class even with the addition of equity and inclusion initiatives, it is critical to reimagine and reconceptualize the entire system, its core mission, and its work. Under the current strategic plan, UC Berkeley has not been forced to examine critically or change its relationship with underserved communities to advance racially equitable structural change outside of the university in ways that are not tied to its research mission, nor has it been forced to dismantle university systems and processes that were always meant to exclude the vast majority of communities. The equity plan only holds UC Berkeley accountable to becoming *more excellent* as an academic institution by using people of color and their historical

underrepresentation in higher education as a means to an administrative end within the same institutional structure.

The challenges UC Berkeley has faced in developing initiatives that actually disrupt the dominant, normative practices that structure and racially stratify the university are not unique to Berkeley alone. In their review of diversity, inclusion, equity, and justice (DIEJ) initiatives in higher education from 1968—2018, Patton et al. (2019) argue that most DIEJ initiatives and their accompanying changes take place through an interest convergence framework (Bell, 1980). In this framework, as was the case with the formation of the first black studies and ethnic studies programs, university administrators create diversity-related changes only to the extent that the changes disproportionately benefit the institution rather than the lives of the students, faculty, and staff of color who demand the transformation of the racial power structures at their universities. In the case of postsecondary institutions, such changes mean minor adjustments that largely leave their underlying systems, structures, and missions intact even if these structures are known to be premised on the systematic suppression of the experiences and ways of constructing knowledge that historically underrepresented students bring to their work. According to Patton et al. (2019), DEIJ initiatives in the form of enhanced student support services, curricular changes, administrative and professional development initiatives and trainings, and institutional policy changes are largely conceived of and structured to benefit white students by putting in place resources and programming that will help enhance these students' *individual* knowledge of and ability to talk about racial difference and the value of diversity. However, these initiatives are not meant to challenge or dismantle the underlying racist foundations of the university itself. Even with new equity and inclusion resources in place that will presumably "counter" the negative effects of existing programs, existing university structures and practices can continue to disenfranchise students of color because the equity resources rarely seek to change substantively the underlying ideologies and premises of the

curricular programs, student support structures, and staff and faculty recruitment strategies already known to be problematic for people of color (p. 190). Instead, Patton et al. (2019) find that these approaches largely focus on enhancing interactions between students in order to foster stronger cross-cultural relationships and multicultural understandings of diversity — practices whose benefits are meant to accrue to the individual. Like Berkeley's equity and inclusion initiatives, they are introduced as additive measures meant to benefit all members of the campus community within the existing institutional system at the expense of prioritizing deep structural and ideological transformations that would most benefit the student populations who demanded change to begin with. Equally concerning is their finding that education researchers who study DEIJ initiatives similarly fall into the pattern of refusing to expose or analyze critically the processes by which equity and inclusion initiatives allow systemic power hierarchies and oppression to persist. Although equity and inclusion research regularly presents comprehensive data about students' and administrators' experiences with and responses to the DEIJ programming, Patton et al. (2019) note the pervasive tendency within the corpus of DEIJ literature for researchers themselves to discuss stakeholders' responses to the initiatives within the institutional frameworks of decreasing racial bias and increasing representation within the university with little to no analysis about how these policies reinforce the very systems of racial oppression that they are presumably meant to address. By avoiding discussion of systemic conditions both in and outside of the university that maintain racial inequities and by refusing to confront the ways in which university practices are designed systematically to subordinate and exclude students of color, researchers contribute to the ongoing perception that any failures to achieve diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education are individual failures. According to this logic, such failures can be solved easily through programming that enhances one's individual knowledge, increases individual awareness, and changes individual action. The excellence of the diverse and equitable university, in other words, is framed by researchers as the product of the

presumably accumulative power of supplemental initiatives whose benefits accrue individually rather than structurally.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives within the University of California Writing Programs and the Constraints of Program Learning Objectives and Outcomes

While administrators present equity and inclusion initiatives largely as campus-wide initiatives or, in the case of the University of California, as system-wide initiatives, academic departments' and programs' widespread use of equity initiatives alongside colorblind disciplinary practices is less visible in existing research. Equity research tends to focus on equity and inclusion largely in terms of the curriculum or pedagogy at the departmental level (Patton et al., 2019), but neglect to focus on course learning outcomes as a source of ongoing racial inequity in education. Departments often use course readings and learning outcomes to indicate that they are embracing diverse course content and using culturally relevant pedagogies, but leave intact course learning outcomes that reproduce disciplinary conventions, methodologies, and ways of constructing knowledge that contribute to the ongoing and systematic racial subordination of students of color. Pedagogical practices meant to attend to the cultural knowledge and rich lived experiences of underrepresented students at the university can, in effect, side step structural change by continuing to work in service of seemingly neutral program learning outcomes and disciplinary practices that in fact protect and contribute to the normalization of racial inequity and subordination in academic fields.

The writing programs within the UC system offer one example of how efforts to create equitable structural transformations at the departmental level can fail when departments invest too heavily in the interlocking logics of university excellence, the perceived need to enhance individual knowledge about diversity, and the rhetoric of equity and inclusion despite their perceived value as drivers of change. The University of California's Policy on Diversity

(University of California Assembly of the Academic Senate, 2020) was adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate, endorsed by the UC President in 2006, and subsequently amended in 2010. However, similar to the limitations of UC Berkeley's strategic plan for equity and inclusion, which has largely left foundational structures in the university intact (only changing university practices to be more inclusive of underrepresented populations to the extent that they allow the university to become more "excellent"), the UC's systemwide diversity policy has made few inroads in changing the actual structures, objectives, and normative logics guiding the work of academic departments and programs that have historically disenfranchised students of color. A brief look at the program learning outcomes and student learning objectives of several of the writing programs within the UC system (UC Santa Cruz Writing Program, 2019; UC Davis University Writing Program, 2019; UC Merced Karen Merritt Writing Program, 2019) makes clear that while the ongoing departmental and university-wide interest in diversity and equity efforts may inform and shape writing curricula, UC writing departments continue to treat diversity, equity, and inclusion as multicultural content. Even when they adopt equity initiatives, writing programs still engage with diversity only as something to be read about, talked about, and written about. It is used as a tool to help students meet and master putatively neutral and skill-based learning objectives that in fact reinforce the racial hierarchies that structure academic institutions.

UC Santa Cruz (UCSC), for instance, has made concerted efforts over the years to embrace diversity by implementing various initiatives that showcase its commitments to creating a more inclusive environment on campus. These initiatives include:

- the adoption of diversity as one of its first community principles
- the formation of the 2009-2010 Diversity Advisory Committee to discuss diversity on campus with an eye towards the unique needs of various stakeholders on campus (UCSC Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, 2011)

48

- the creation of the Campus Inclusive Climate Council that advises the university on how to create an inclusive educational environment for the campus

- the launch of UCSC's 2011 Diversity and Community Building Study to evaluate and reassess the campus's campus culture and support systems

- the establishment of the Chancellor's Achievement Awards for Diversity to acknowledge the work that individual faculty, staff, students, and programs have done to build new programs and opportunities that further equity and diversity efforts on campus

- the ongoing maintenance of the Faculty Diversity and Inclusion Programs, Staff Diversity and Inclusion Programs, and Student Diversity and Inclusion Programs

- the formation of and ongoing support for UCSC's Critical Race and Ethnic Studies program after a years-long faculty- and student-led fight to establish Ethnic Studies in response to extreme xenophobia on campus (UCSC Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, 2011)

While these are campus-wide initiatives and are intended to have widespread effects in all aspects of the university's institutional structure, processes, and function, they have not yet translated to widespread or structural changes in existing academic departments and programs that have historically struggled to support the needs of underrepresented students. Individual faculty or staff members of academic departments may serve on the committees and contribute to the various diversity-related programming on campus, for instance; however, in looking at the 19-page list of UCSC centers, programs, residence colleges, and teams that comprise and contribute to the UCSC Diversity Accountability Framework (2012), individual academic departments and programs at UCSC are notably absent from the list, with the exception of UCSC's Critical Race and Ethnic Studies Program. The existence of robust campus-wide equity initiatives and programming does not necessarily mean that departments have a stake in contributing to these efforts in an ongoing or systematic way, nor does this mean that the initiatives and the opportunities available on campus for rethinking equity will lead to structural changes at the departmental level. Individual departments and programs have made incremental progress towards addressing the needs of students of color by including culturally relevant teaching

material in their curricula, but the established policies and practices that they choose to leave intact even as they work towards curricular change are telling.

In its spring 2020 course offerings, for instance, the UCSC writing program offered a handful of writing courses on topics related to social and racial justice. This included a Writing 2 course titled "Mapping the Neighborhood: Writing about Communities, Social Justice, Social Change" in which students were to examine gentrification, race, class, and activism through the framework of urban studies. The course theme and assigned texts reflect the goals of the campus-wide equity initiatives and community principles, signaling a concerted effort to open spaces in the writing program where students could analyze intersectionality, assess how structural inequities shape community neighborhoods, and determine how community-led activist movements can challenge the disproportionate effects that gentrification have on working class people of color. The discussion of these critically important topics and realities, however, have not necessarily led to a larger-scale move to overhaul and reformulate the program's ways of conceptualizing writing and writing instruction more broadly. This would necessitate not only changing course content but also confronting the pedagogical approaches and disciplinary practices that have historically tied what counts as "good writing" to the subordination of oppressed groups in writing classes. The Writing 2 "Mapping the Neighborhood" course, for instance, focused its attention on helping students build their critical understandings of race and class in urban spaces, but the course description reveals that students were still expected to write about these issues in the context of traditional genre theory, rhetoric, revision, and sentence-level editing. These approaches align with what Lu (1999a) describes as composition's tendency to align itself with presumably "objective" scientific methods for knowledge construction and expression. According to Lu, these disciplinary frameworks and pedagogies in theory allow all individuals from different backgrounds to express themselves freely because they are supposedly neutral and objective; yet, Lu argues that such approaches in

fact leverage the "neutrality" of effective writing to teach students how to write about and analyze marginalized communities from the narrow perspectives and language of those in power. Lu's argument suggests that even if students are reading about and analyzing class and race and considering how communities begin movements against gentrification, they must be wary of the rhetorical and genre-based frameworks with which and in which they are asked to write. According to Lu, most disciplinary frameworks and genres in composition reproduce and reinforce the very inequities, logics, and power structures instructors claim to be challenging when they ask students to read and write about multicultural course content and personal experiences. Even if students are discussing concepts that speak to the need for social change for the benefit of working class communities of color, Lu's warning thus merits careful consideration: the genres and methodologies with which and within which students write must always be examined and considered with the recognition that they have historically encouraged the construction and reproduction of analytical frameworks and ways of constructing arguments that privilege the logics and perspectives of those in power.

A more careful look at the course learning outcomes of the UCSC writing program reveals that the program's learning objectives are, like the stated objectives of the Writing 2 "Mapping the Neighborhood" course, similarly premised on reproducing the genre- and rhetoric-based approach to writing and language that Lu (1999a) critiques. This raises questions about the extent to which UCSC's campus-wide equity and inclusion initiatives have resulted in deeper structural change within the campus's departments and programs that move beyond topical changes in course themes and readings. The learning outcomes in UCSC's writing program (UC Santa Cruz Writing Program, 2019), which are broken down by their two-course writing sequence (Composition 1 and Composition 2), are as follows:

Composition 1, Introduction to University Discourse
At the end of Composition 1, students will be able to …

51

1) Identify and use rhetorical concepts (such as audience, purpose, context or genre) to analyze and write about a variety of texts.
2) Use strategies such as response, analysis, interpretation, or critique to produce writing that draws connections between texts and student writers' perspectives.
3) Support their ideas through the use of examples, personal experience, observations, and/or appropriately cited source material.
4) Compose projects through multiple drafts by revising for focus, quality of content, and/or coherence.
5) Implement strategies to edit their work according to genre and disciplinary conventions such as arrangement, language use, mechanics, or documentation style.
6) Reflect critically on their processes for writing and analysis.

Composition 2, Rhetoric and Inquiry
At the end of Composition 2, students will be able to …

1) Compose in more than one genre by responding to rhetorical situations and genre conventions according to readers' expectations and writers' purposes.
2) Ask questions and be guided by a strategic exploration of those questions in order to generate research topics and sustain meaningful inquiry.
3) Locate relevant source material, evaluate its credibility, and cite it appropriately.
4) Analyze and synthesize ideas in source material to produce projects that interpret and evaluate their own ideas and assumptions, as well as those of other writers.
5) Apply strategies when composing, revising, or evaluating their own work that enable them to follow conventions of professional English, such as arrangement, language use, mechanics, or documentation style.
6) Reflect critically on how to apply their processes for writing and analysis to writing projects in other contexts, within and outside the university

Most of the writing program's learning outcomes focus on helping students acquire facility in reading processes, analytical inquiry, and writing processes. By learning how to synthesize ideas and texts, write in multiple genres, and follow discipline-specific conventions, the students will become "*versatile, flexible* writers who communicate effectively in a variety of writing situations and disciplinary fields" (UC Santa Cruz Writing Program, 2019, emphasis added). This approach ensures that students will become adept at applying the logics and skills that characterize each discipline, which will not only allow them to master the conventions needed to achieve literacy success in the university, but that will also allow them to become active members of and participants in these discourse communities. This outcomes-based approach to teaching writing, however, is directly tied in the neoliberal university to the pervasive interest in assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of education through the use of performance

indicators and standards. For the purposes of productivity and efficiency, these performance indicators assume that the same learning outcomes and methods for achieving those outcomes are universally relevant and applicable to all students. Program learning outcomes in writing programs such as UCSC's, in effect, may certainly help students to become more adept at understanding the various disciplinary practices in different fields, but they exist largely to help writing program and university administrators measure the extent to which students can meet and master performance targets. Unlike test scores, these learning outcomes and targets might not be quantifiable, but they are similarly designed to regulate and standardize student performance and skills. Genre-based and rhetorical learning outcomes thus require students to follow and reproduce the practices, concepts, and methods that already characterize writing across the disciplines so they can master each genre's conventions, rhetorical approach, sentence-level mechanics, and professional style. This approach encourages students to align with very the methodologies and frameworks that Lu (1999a) warns are produced by those in positions of power and which she argues come at the expense of students of color whose politics and ways of constructing knowledge are often distinctly at odds with normative standards.

We can see similar expectations at play in the UC Davis writing program's student learning objectives. UC Davis's objectives state that students will "learn to read more difficult texts closely and critically and to use them as models for writing projects," "learn to conduct research in writing studies and professional writing," and "learn to read closely and critically and to analyze the purpose, audience, format, and conventions in varied types of writing" (UC Davis University Writing Program, 2019). Moreover, they will also "understand how writing and citing conventions vary in different disciplines and professions" (UC Davis University Writing Program, 2019). Similar to UCSC's learning objectives, UC Davis's objectives also emphasize the importance of reproducing what compositionists believe are the crucial procedures, characteristics, stylistic details, and analytical methods associated with different types of writing.

In doing so, its writing program highlights the value of conforming to convention: students gain a deep understanding of the disciplinary practices that structure both academic and professional disciplines by reproducing what count as the dominant logics, forms, and methodological approaches in writing within and across the disciplines. However, in assuming that all texts can and should be read and written about using generic analytical approaches, writing programs overlook other ways of seeing, interpreting, and analyzing. This leaves little room to acknowledge both the weaknesses of rhetorical and genre-based methods as well as the dangers of relying on analytical approaches whose universal criteria and methods (including audience, purpose/intention, and rhetorical situation) are always determined in advance and out of context.

Researchers in writing studies would deny that learning outcomes are linked to conformity. As opposed to standards, which focus on measuring a student's level of performance by the number of times they successfully use and apply discrete skills within their writing (Blake Yancey, 2005), compositionists see learning outcomes as "the *what* of education" — what they describe as "what it is that we want students *to know, to understand,* and *to do* at the conclusion of a course, a program, a major" (Blake Yancey, 2005, p. 21). Because learning outcomes are not tied to quantifiable performance levels and instead serve as the foundation for both curricular frameworks as well as program assessments (Blake Yancey, 2005, p. 21-22), compositionists argue that they are flexible: they are designed to be used, assessed, and interpreted with process and context in mind. This allows writing instructors and writing program administrators to use outcomes alongside observation-based analysis to answer questions like "what knowledge, understanding, and skills do students acquire as a function of participating in this program?", "what has contributed to students' development? What has hindered it?", and "how can you take what you have learned in this process and enhance your program?" (Blake Yancey, 2005, p. 22). In this sense, the seeming freedom that learning

54

outcomes offer arguably fit the goals of equity and inclusion initiatives from an instructional standpoint. They ostensibly allow writing instructors to bring a multitude of pedagogical, curricular, and interactive approaches to their work with students that would presumably fit the learning styles and needs of a diverse student population. The WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition that was generated by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (2000), for example, was designed to reflect the knowledge, skills, and understandings that most first-year composition programs could reasonably expect their students to learn after being in these courses. It was meant to serve as a framework that would at once establish a common foundation for all first-year composition programs while simultaneously providing enough flexibility for writing programs and instructors to meet the context-specific needs of their unique teaching styles, their institutions, their university administrations, and their students. Key outcomes expected of students spanned areas such as rhetorical knowledge (e.g., helping students understand how audience, genre, field, and rhetorical situation shape reading and writing); critical thinking, reading, and writing (helping students understand the tasks associated with critical reading, critical thinking, writing, and communication within a given field); process (helping students build strategies for writing, revising, editing, and presenting their work that are at once individual and collaborative efforts); and knowledge of conventions (helping students gain familiarity with genre-based formats, conventions, structures, and forms, and helping them build strategies to use these conventions with ease) (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2000). As such, the Outcomes Statement is considered to be a critical tool for helping instructors and writing programs build curricula, assignments, and programs that will not only be more responsive to the needs of diverse student populations, but which are capable of supporting diverse student populations' long-term success. The WPA Outcomes Statement and learning outcomes are thus considered to "establish a basis for equity … a standard measure of what all students should be able to do after going through the composition program" because

55

they are presumably "educational experiences to which each student has access" (Wiley, 2005, p. 30),

It is important to note, however, that the WPA's Outcomes Statement still presents learning outcomes as objective and neutral. Although the Outcomes Statement frames rhetorical and convention-based knowledge as essential tools for students because they allow students to take up discourses that are crucial for public recognition and acceptance, composition researchers such as Min-Zhan Lu have long critiqued the supposed objectivity and value of genre-based and rhetorical models of academic writing for their failure to acknowledge that students and communities of color are systematically excluded from dominant academic discourses and forms. Indeed, as Lu (1999a, 1999b) argues, such perceptions of the unparalleled power and value of academic conventions and language imply that "academic discourse has been, is, and will inevitably be the language of public transaction … and … may very well lead students to see the function of formal English as a *timeless* linguistic law which they must respect, adapt to, and perpetuate rather than as a specific historical circumstance resulting from the unequal distribution of social power and as a condition which they must recognize but can also call into question and change" (Lu, 1999b, p. 114). In effect, the standardized conventions, forms, and genres that program learning outcomes reproduce allow both instructors, administrators, and students to ignore the social and political histories of contestation and oppression that structure academic writing and discourse. Rather than acknowledging that learning outcomes and disciplinary genres are the product of the active and ongoing suppression of other discourses and forms of literacy, statements like the WPA's Outcomes Statement instead present learning outcomes as objective tools that, once mastered, automatically give students the power and flexibility they need to participate in and gain a voice through their writing within a multitude of contexts. Yet, contrary to the general perception, pushing students to meet standardized learning outcomes does not ensure the greater representation of

historically underrepresented voices in academia or lead to equitable long-term outcomes for those students who take up these discourses. Instead, it actively reifies a model of functional literacy that, as Lu (1999a) describes it, neutralizes the transformative potential of writing by making these forms, genres, and analytical approaches across disciplines seem natural, necessary, and immutable. This, in turn, reduces the probability that students of color will actively question the work and effects of these seemingly universal objectives during their time in their writing classes and at the university.

Within the UC system specifically, writing programs' insistence on still maintaining rhetorical and genre-based conventions within their writing standards indicates that equity and inclusion initiatives have limited ability to promote significant structural and pedagogical change within departments themselves. Nowhere within UCSC's or UC Davis's learning objectives can we see evidence that campus-wide equity and inclusion initiatives force writing programs to restructure their learning objectives to account for the systematic exclusion of students and communities of color within conventional disciplinary practices. Commitments to creating classroom spaces that are more inclusive of diverse populations and viewpoints through new course themes and readings do not seem to have translated into a concerted effort to reconceptualize or reformulate the standards by which student writing, their performance, and their ability to meet target outcomes are actually assessed. While a course might allow students to read texts about diverse populations and racial justice, the learning outcomes indicate that students are still expected to produce essays that reflect the dominant logics and forms that, as Lu (1999a, 1999b) reminds us, emerged from suppressing non-dominant ways of using language, conceptualizing genre, and conceiving of the work of academic writing. In these contexts, students do not actually have much flexibility to write or produce written material that significantly deviates from the expected genres, linguistic forms, tones, and analytical structures characteristic of the rhetorical school.

Even UC San Diego's (UCSD) Dimensions of Culture writing program, which pushes conventional boundaries by structuring its entire course sequence around diversity, justice, and imagination in order to realign with the original visions and politics of the Lumumba/Zapata College that emerged from the social movements of the 1960s and 70s, still retains learning outcomes that reflect goals common to most writing programs. The Dimensions of Culture program shares its critical thinking, reading and writing across genres, writing process, and revision process learning outcomes not only with UCSD's other college-specific writing programs, but also with other UC writing programs. The Dimensions of Culture program's curricular content importantly pushes students to examine the "inequality and lack of opportunity experienced by various groups over time" by having them study immigration history, social movements, and cultural production; yet, its learning outcomes still expect students to "develop and refine critical thinking skills; develop an ability to read, understand, and analyze diverse genres and formats; revise and refine written communication on the levels of argument, evidence, grammar, style, etc.; learn and follow a proper citation protocol (MLA)" (UC San Diego Dimensions of Culture Program, 2019). The program's outcomes reflect the same genre-and form-based interests that comprise UCSC's and UC Davis's learning outcomes and are similarly structured around the expectation that students should be able to identify and reproduce specified elements and forms of academic writing that are recognizable to and expected within professional writing genres. These shared learning outcomes across the three campuses pay little attention to the ways that these putatively objective or race-neutral writing formats — grammar, style, and evidence in particular — have been and continue to be used to privilege the perspectives and power of those who reproduce these conventions at the expense of those who do not. The UC writing programs — and even those programs whose thematic content focuses exclusively on racial and social justice — are curiously silent about how their learning outcomes work in relation to this history of writing- and reading-based exclusion

and marginalization, suggesting that the UC's systemwide commitment to diversity and equity is not enough to create structural change in the departments themselves. The prevailing responsibility of the UC writing programs and their faculty remains to ensure that students are well-positioned to develop the kinds of academic skills that will prepare them to reproduce the logics of the university and academic disciplines by adopting conventional reading, writing, and research practices steeped in the rhetorical and genre-based schools. Rather than preparing students to build new analytical writing, reading, and research approaches that are informed by social and historical realities, learning objectives steeped in the discourse of neutrality and universal applicability instead focus on what can be done to help the individual student master the conventions that will allow them to advance within the existing academic power structure. In the process of doing so, they end up reinforcing and maintaining the value and rules of these systems instead of helping students of color and historically excluded groups transform the institutions and their social roles.

UC Merced has attempted to address these limitations by making a concerted, multi-year effort to build programming, curricula, and learning outcomes into its writing program with an explicit focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion. This effort began within the UC Merced Merritt Writing Program and runs parallel to the university's campus-wide equity and inclusion initiatives. It is largely driven and run by the writing program faculty for the benefit of the writing program itself and the students enrolled in their classes. Although the UC Merced writing faculty recognize that diversity and equity initiatives must be adjusted to reflect the unique needs of writing instruction, however, their equity efforts are similarly structured around the premise that diversity and inclusion can simply exist as supplements to stable program learning outcomes. In this form, equity initiatives are tools designed to work within existing program structures and alongside standard learning outcomes: because they operate under the assumption that learning outcomes are race-neutral, these equity initiatives fail to examine the

59

processes by which learning outcomes themselves emerge from and reproduce racial inequities and functional literacy. The UC Merced Merritt Writing Program's two-year, grant-supported efforts to build its diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives in writing instruction (UC Merced Merritt Writing Program, 2019; UC Merced Merritt Writing Program, 2018), for instance, have largely focused on *adding* diversity and inclusion to an already-existing structural framework and set of established course learning outcomes rather than attempting to change the framework of its program and learning outcomes entirely. Its Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion grants have been used to fund the following projects: two faculty common reads; a mini-conference where faculty discuss how to apply the common reads towards writing pedagogy and curricula; the development of materials for faculty and student use (including a campus climate survey, a collection of diversity lesson plans and diversity course syllabi, a diversity course reader, and a library guide based on the diversity reader); a capstone teaching symposium where instructors shared their methods for making their classrooms diverse, equitable, and inclusive; the creation of a common diversity writing prompt and rubric; an accompanying set of workshops to assess both the common diversity prompt and student work in response to the prompt; and a new diversity course learning outcome. These activities importantly attempt to support the instructors who teach a student population where over 80% of students identify as students of color and 72% identify as first-generation college students (UC Merced Merritt Writing Program, 2018, p. 5). They introduce materials designed to help instructors build the necessary theoretical background, pedagogical toolkits, professional support networks, and applied models that can be used to transform their teaching approaches. That said, the model they use still largely works within the constraints of well-established institutional structures, learning outcomes, and disciplinary practices. A new diversity learning outcome, for instance, will soon been added to the UC Merced writing program's five course learning outcomes, but the program's grant proposal explicitly states that the new learning outcome is meant to "allow

60

faculty to create coursework and lectures related to diversity *as a focus separate from our other course learning outcomes of Research Ethics, Rhetoric, Craft, Process, and Collaboration*" (UC Merced Merritt Writing Program, 2019, p. 6, emphasis added). This approach encourages both faculty and students to think about diversity, equity, and inclusion as isolated assignments or activities instead of using these concepts to change the methodological processes and ideological frameworks they use to teach underrepresented students. New course content via the diversity reader, diversity lesson plans, and diversity syllabi may change *what* students read and write about, but these shifts in curriculum and class activities through an add-on approach do not necessarily change the prevailing assumption that writing programs only need to develop supplemental materials and activities for their work to become equitable and inclusive. These equity and inclusion initiatives fail to force writing programs to examine critically and to change the underlying racial politics of program learning outcomes and disciplinary methodologies themselves. In doing so, they thus contribute to institutional reform rather than structural and ideological change.

The common diversity prompt that the UC Merced Writing Program is currently piloting for all students in entry-level reading and composition courses offers an important example in how university writing programs can retain conventional frameworks even as they adopt the language of equity and inclusion in their learning outcomes and assignments. The prompt reads:

> Can you identify an occurrence (example) of access/lack of access, inclusion/ exclusion, or diversity/lack of diversity within a local, national, or global community? In which ways does this example connect to the UCM Principles of Community? In your example, are the UCM Principles of Community being upheld or not being upheld? What are the resulting consequences? How does this example demonstrate the importance of upholding the Principles of Community? (UC Merced Merritt Writing Program, 2019, p. 4).

While UC Merced's new diversity essay creates space for students to write about access, inclusion, and diversity and importantly encourages them to situate these issues in local, national, and global contexts, focusing too closely on these aspects of the prompt disguises its notable

restrictions. The prompt presents access, inclusion, and diversity as binaries and forces students to look at these issues through the simplistic compare/contrast and pro/con frameworks already common to writing classes, composition readers, and composition handbooks. Although it opens opportunities for students to engage in discussions of equity and inclusion, the unspoken expectation is that these discussions are best suited to take place within the constraints of conventional academic writing genres (compare/contrast and pro/con essays) and that, moreover, these issues are best understood within the generic context of UC Merced's principles of community, which include statements such as, "We recognize and celebrate the identities, values, and beliefs of our community. We affirm the inherent dignity and value of every person while cultivating a campus climate rooted in mutual respect and compassion. We uphold the right to freedom of express and encourage a culture of dialogue, understanding, and civility in all interactions. We seek to create a campus where a rich tapestry of ideas is shared, collaboration is embraced, and innovation is promoted" (University of California, Merced, 2020). Within the diversity essay prompt, students are primed to think about whether access or diversity exists or not rather than examining how the histories of racism and structural racism routinely prevent historically underrepresented and marginalized communities from accessing resources and opportunities for advancement in the same ways or with the same degree of success as those with white privilege. Without the space to assess equity and inclusion in more complex ways and in relation to more relevant contexts, this prompt arguably is more invested in ensuring students will write essays that both reproduce the program's binary presentation of access, equity, and inclusion and reinforce the assumed value of the UCM principles of community. Students are not given the space to develop the kinds of analysis capable of challenging and changing these overly simplistic administrative positions and interests. The prompt, in effect, forces students to respond to a question that has already limited the scope of inquiry to simplistic answers and

closes off the most productive possibilities for thinking about the real questions they should be asking instead.

It should be noted that UC Merced's principles of community celebrate inclusion and the diversity of *all* values, beliefs, and identities of the academic community without ever discussing structural and racial barriers to access, advancement, and success for underrepresented populations in and outside of academia. The principles adopt a colorblind, liberal approach to inclusion that Felice Blake and Paula Ioanide (2019) warn increasingly encompasses racist, transphobic, misogynistic, and xenophobic viewpoints deemed acceptable to articulate under the rationale that they must be considered in the name of "inclusivity," "freedom of expression," and "diversity." In the case of UC Merced's diversity prompt, which encourages students to think about diversity within the liberal framework of inclusivity and diversity, students are not encouraged to consider how communities of color continue to be disproportionately and systematically subjected to racist discrimination and exclusion even under seemingly neutral or "inclusive" initiatives such as diversity assignments and principles of community. Despite claims that the newly designed diversity prompt for all students in entry-level writing courses is an opportunity for both students and faculty to "prioritize diversity in their classrooms" (UC Merced Merritt Writing Program, 2019, p. 6) and to foster a culture of dialogue about inclusion, the Merritt Writing Program has historically used common prompts as diagnostic tools for placing students in writing classes, for identifying grammar or reading comprehension issues the students may have, for assessing program learning outcomes, and for norming faculty grading and assessment techniques using the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) criteria and 6-point grading scale. All of these practices reproduce the very forms of linguistic, racial, and socioeconomic discrimination that equity and inclusion initiatives are supposedly committed to dismantling.

The AWPE, for instance, which is a UC system-wide timed writing exam designed to place incoming freshmen into appropriate writing courses, operates under the claim that "there is no 'correct' response for a topic" and claims instead to evaluate students on the basis of several criteria that are ostensibly "open" to and welcoming of different perspectives, writing styles, and interpretations. These criteria include students' comprehension of a reading passage, their ability to answer the prompt, their ability to help readers understand their reasoning and explain how they came to that understanding, and their ability to analyze critically the reading passage using experience or observations (University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement, 2020a). The actual 6-point scoring rubric for the AWPE, however, is less accommodating to difference than the more generic criteria might suggest: student writing is assessed according to the "competence" of the writer's response, the clarity of the writer's response to the reading passage and their ability to elaborate with examples and logical reasoning, and the accuracy of both the writer's word choice and their use of conventional written English (University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement, 2020b). With only three main categories for evaluating student exams, the 6-point scoring rubric puts far greater emphasis on assessing the extent to which students can reproduce the conventional logics and grammatical forms of standard writing genres and standard English during a timed writing event than it does on determining *how* students interpret and build responses and how these unconventional approaches could more effectively inform writing instruction. The AWPE 6-point scoring rubric and the test itself are thus far from neutral. As a tool that was originally designed to separate students into different classes based on perceived linguistic, reading, and writing abilities, the AWPE uses both Standard English and conventional disciplinary forms and genres as the standards with which to assess student work. By its very function as a reading and writing assessment tool, the AWPE measures the "correctness" of students' responses according to standardized performance indicator criteria. The UC Merced writing program's plan to use

the AWPE 6-point scoring rubric to assess student responses to its already problematic diversity prompt would only serve to reinforce and extend the program's — and UC system's — long history of assessing and placing students into "remedial" writing classes according to racist performance standards. While the writing program at UC Merced has committed to developing a multi-year series of diversity faculty workshops that would help them build and recalibrate what they call a Diversity Value Rubric (UC Merced Merritt Writing Program, 2019) — a rubric that specifically assesses evidence of diversity in student writing — such initiatives still reflect efforts to standardize and norm according to well-established criteria assumed to be universally applicable to all contexts. In the process of doing so, these initiatives reproduce the very logics and forms of exclusion they are presumably committed to moving away from.

The administrative ends to which diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives within the UC system have historically been designed and used have largely failed to lead to widespread structural transformations in academic departments and student educational experiences. As initiatives that, as in the case of UC Berkeley, are meant to contribute largely to the growth of institutional excellence and numerical representation, campus- and system-wide diversity and inclusion efforts have rarely translated into substantive changes at the departmental and curricular levels because they are not meant to transform the established discipline-based frameworks, logics, and systems that structure department learning objectives and outcomes. Including diverse perspectives, inclusive rhetoric, and multicultural readings into writing program curriculum under the banner of campus-wide diversity efforts does not require that faculty change the dominant standards by which students of color's and multilingual students' work and ability have historically been assessed, nor are faculty required to acknowledge the histories of contestation and power that structure the seemingly neutral conventions of academic writing. Instead, it has meant devoting resources towards faculty training so they are equipped to build add-on units about diversity and multiculturalism into their syllabi and to create a multitude of

new prompts that ask students to write *about* diversity. These efforts gesture towards inclusion but in fact allow faculty to continue evaluating student work according to putatively universal assessment rubrics that ignore students' real discourses, methods, and approaches. Even as they write about diverse texts and topics under diversity initiatives, students are still forced to reproduce the traditional genres, grammatical forms, analytical methods, and rhetorical conventions that structure writing studies. Departments' local efforts to create their own diversity outcomes, diversity prompts, and diversity rubrics have similarly failed. Their insistence on maintaining a longitudinal focus on assessment, tracking, and norming along well-established parameters and fixed outcomes deliberately exclude non-traditional reading, writing, and analytical methods. These diversity efforts ultimately continue to support administrative efforts to standardize at the expense of reimagining the work of writing courses so they can support underrepresented students more effectively.

Threshold Concepts and Labor-Based Grading Contracts: Researcher- and Practitioner-Generated Foundational Concepts, and the Reproduction of Administrative and Disciplinary Logics and Processes

Writing programs' ongoing investment in maintaining conventional learning outcomes and writing genres structured in racial inequities is symptomatic of a larger problem in writing studies. Individual composition researchers and practitioners have made efforts to move away from more traditional learning outcomes, but the larger field has struggled to do so without reproducing the very ideologies it tries to move away from. Since 2015, for instance, there has been a concerted effort by composition researchers to make a distinction between administrator-generated program and course learning outcomes from researcher-generated foundational concepts in the field. The underlying argument is that the discipline-specific concepts are more

accurate representations of the work the field actually does, and thus should guide and structure the field's research and teaching pedagogies.

The recent publication of Adler-Kassner and Wardle's (2015) edited volume on threshold concepts in writing studies, has played a key role in building this momentum in writing studies. *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015) attempts to name and define the basic principles that comprise the field and has gained popularity in university composition programs because it is premised on the questions asked, work done, and ways of thinking in writing studies. Threshold concepts offer writing instructors a convenient, alternative framework both to shape their classroom pedagogy and to shift student writing from a decontextualized skill set driven by administrative learning outcomes to a coherent set of disciplinary practices informed by writing studies experts and research. Threshold concepts are "*the content of composition*: the questions, kinds of evidence, and materials that define the discipline and that would thus define us [compositionists] as well" (Blake Yancey, 2015a, p. 28). They are, in essence, the concepts, features, practices, beliefs, and ways of thinking that writing scholars agree are critical to the study and work of their discipline and that thus shape the work writing instructors do both in their classrooms and in their research on writing. In total, contributors to the volume offer thirty-seven threshold concepts, meta-concepts, and sub-concepts that are central to their field, which include the following:

Metaconcept:	Writing is an Activity and a Subject of Study
Concept 1:	Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity
Sub-concept 1.0:	Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity
Sub-concept 1.1:	Writing is a Knowledge-Making Activity
Sub-concept 1.2:	Writing Addresses, Invokes, and/or Creates Audiences
Sub-concept 1.3:	Writing Expresses and Shares Meaning to be Reconstructed by the Reader
Sub-concept 1.4:	Words Get Their Meanings from Other Words
Sub-concept 1.5:	Writing Mediates Activity
Sub-concept 1.6:	Writing is Not Natural
Sub-concept 1.7:	Assessing Writing Shapes Contexts and Instruction
Sub-concept 1.8:	Writing Involves Making Ethical Choices
Sub-Concept 1.9:	Writing is a Technology Through Which Writers Create and

	Recreate Meaning
Concept 2:	Writing Speaks to Situations Through Recognizable Forms
Sub-concept 2.0:	Writing Speaks to Situations Through Recognizable Forms
Sub-concept 2.1:	Writing Represents the World, Events, Ideas, and Feelings
Sub-concept 2.2:	Genres are Enacted by Writers and Readers
Sub-concept 2.3:	Writing is a Way of Enacting Disciplinarity
Sub-concept 2.4:	All Writing is Multimodal
Sub-concept 2.5:	Writing is Performative
Sub-concept 2.6:	Texts Get Their Meaning from Other Texts
Concept 3:	Writing Enacts and Creates Identities and Ideologies
Sub-concept 3.0:	Writing Enacts and Creates Identities and Ideologies
Sub-concept 3.1:	Writing is Linked to Identity
Sub-concept 3.2:	Writers' Histories, Processes, and Identities Vary
Sub-concept 3.3:	Writing is Informed by Prior Experience
Sub-concept 3.4:	Disciplinary and Professional Identities are Constructed Through Writing
Sub-concept 3.5:	Writing Provides a Representation of Ideologies and Identities
Concept 4:	All Writers Have More to Learn
Sub-concept 4.0:	All Writers Have More to Learn
Sub-concept 4.1:	Text is an Object Outside of Oneself that can be Improved and Developed
Sub-concept 4.2:	Failure can be an Important Part of Writing Development
Sub-concept 4.3:	Learning to Write Effectively Requires Different Kinds of Practice, Time, & Effort
Sub-concept 4.4:	Revision is Central to Developing Writing
Sub-concept 4.5:	Assessment is an Essential Component of Learning to Write
Sub-concept 4.6:	Writing Involves the Negotiation of Language Differences
Concept 5:	Writing is (Also Always) a Cognitive Activity
Sub-concept 5.0:	Writing is (Also Always) a Cognitive Activity
Sub-concept 5.1:	Writing is an Expression of Embodied Cognition
Sub-concept 5.2:	Metacognition is Not Cognition
Sub-concept 5.3:	Habituated Practice can lead to Entrenchment
Sub-concept 5.4:	Reflection is Critical for Writers' Development

(Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015)

Adler-Kassner and Wardle (2015) and the contributors to the volume take care to distinguish these threshold concepts, meta-concepts, and sub-concepts from learning outcomes, noting that whereas learning outcomes can be taught and rely on assessment-based end products (Estrem, 2015a, p. 239), threshold concepts instead reflect the "conceptual and ontological shifts students must undertake to achieve capability in writing" (Land, 2015, p. 18). Threshold concepts inform ongoing student learning, practice, and participation in their writing-based projects and thus are best understood experientially, over time, and across curricula (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015, p.

78). As long-term conceptual transformations, threshold concepts help students to adopt the ways of thinking and doing that characterize the discipline and its researchers, and by extension, help them build the foundation they need to write in ways that are more authentic to the field. In these ways, the switch to threshold concepts is meant to ensure that students and instructors will not be restricted to producing work or conceptualizing writing in ways that are antithetical to the principle disciplinary practices that constitute writing studies.

This distinction between threshold concepts and learning outcomes is importantly meant to challenge attempts by both state legislatures (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015, p. 71-72) and university administrators to standardize writing curricula and instruction via outcomes-based assessments. Efforts to standardize what counts as evidence of reading and writing effectively in K-12 education through initiatives like the Common Core State Standards directly impact the work that writing instructors can do with their students in classrooms as administrators push for similar standards to be implemented in higher education writing classes (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015, p. 71-72). Under the logics of neoliberalism, university administrators and managers have increasingly linked teaching and learning to learning outcomes and performance standards, even if the standards do not reflect what writing instructors, researchers, and practitioners know to be the best practices and guiding principles in their field (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015). Under the constraints of teaching models and standardized curricula that prioritize the logics of efficiency, productivity, and measurable outcomes, writing experts have little room to use the practices, theories, and methods that they know to be critical for student success. In this context, then, threshold concepts have become critical tools that writing instructors have used to challenge directly the increasingly restrictive logics of managerial efficiency that structure their departments and programs: by using threshold concepts written by specialists in the field to name and define the disciplinary practices, questions, methods, and skills that shape their work, composition researchers and practitioners have been able to situate

the work of academic writing within the larger academic, professional, and social contexts that they, as experts in their field, know are critical for student learning, engagement, and success. Writing experts have thus been able to translate the seminal and research-based findings, foundational theories, and practices of their field into threshold concepts that non-specialist audiences can grasp (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015, p. 73) while also redefining what counts as "good" writing within a coherent disciplinary context. Unlike the decontextualized and skills-based administrative standards that shape traditional learning outcomes, threshold concepts have given compositionists the tools they need to re-situate the work of academic writing within the contexts that they know are most relevant to teaching and learning, thus giving students an accessible language and framework with which to build accurate understandings of the field's guiding principles so they can apply the field's foundational concepts to their own work.

Yet, upon closer inspection, the threshold concepts generated by researchers in the discipline are not fundamentally different from the traditional program or course learning outcomes they purport to challenge. Threshold concepts that the field has agreed upon, such as "Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity" (Roozen, 2015, p. 90) or "Writing Speaks to Situations Through Recognizable Forms" (Bazerman, 2015b, p. 128) are still rooted in the notion that writing is necessarily tied to issues of audience (Lunsford, 2015a), the processes of both producing and reconstructing context-specific meanings (Bazerman, 2015b; Estrem, 2015b), and the creation of genres (Hart-Davidson, 2015) and disciplines (Lerner, 2015). These ways of thinking about writing in fact reflect similar administrative and product-driven goals found within most conventional program and course learning outcomes — including those learning outcomes that UC writing programs have widely adopted — that teach students to focus on rhetoric, audience, context, and genres. A brief comparison between threshold concepts and the various learning outcomes in UC writing programs makes this likeness visible (see Table 1).

Table 1

Comparison of Threshold Concepts and UC Writing Programs' Learning Outcomes

Threshold Concepts and Sub-Concepts	UC Merced Program Learning Outcomes	UC Santa Cruz Program Learning Outcomes	UC Davis Program Learning Outcomes
1.0 Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity (Roozen, 2015, p. 90)	PLO 2 (Rhetoric): Select and apply the appropriate conventions of personal, academic, or professional forms of expression	1) Identify and use rhetorical concepts (such as audience, purpose, context, or genre) to analyze and write about a variety of texts (Composition 1 Outcomes)	Students will learn to improve their ability to work collaboratively in peer workshops, group work, and group projects
1.2 Writing Addresses, Invokes, and/or Creates Audiences (Lunsford, 2015a, p. 97)	PLO 2 (Rhetoric): Select and apply the appropriate conventions of personal, academic, or professional forms of expression	1) Identify and use rhetorical concepts (such as audience, purpose, context, or genre) to analyze and write about a variety of texts (Composition 1 Outcomes)	Students will learn to read closely and critically and to analyze the purpose, audience, format, and conventions in varied types of writing
1.3 Writing Expresses and Shares Meaning to be Reconstructed by the Reader (Bazerman, 2015b, p. 99)	PLO 3 (Collaboration): Synthesize diverse perspectives through collaboration in academic discourse communities	2) Use strategies such as response, analysis, interpretation, or critique to produce writing that draws connections between texts and student writers' perspectives (Composition 1 Outcomes) 4) Analyze and synthesize ideas in source material to produce projects that interpret and evaluate their own ideas and assumptions, as well as those of other writers (Composition 2 Outcomes) 1) Compose in more than one genre by responding to rhetorical situations and genre conventions according to readers' expectations and writers' purposes (Composition 2 Outcomes)	Students will learn to improve their ability to work collaboratively in peer workshops, group work, and group projects Students will learn to integrate ideas, data, and evidence from written and oral sources into writing projects

Threshold Concepts and Sub-Concepts	UC Merced Program Learning Outcomes	UC Santa Cruz Program Learning Outcomes	UC Davis Program Learning Outcomes
2.0 Writing Speaks to Situations Through Recognizable Form (Bazerman, 2015, p. 128)	PLO 2 (Rhetoric): Select and apply the appropriate conventions of personal, academic, or professional forms of expression	5) Implement strategies to edit their work according to genre and disciplinary conventions such as arrangement, language use, mechanics, or documentation style (Composition 1 Outcomes) 1) Compose in more than one genre by responding to rhetorical situations and genre conventions according to readers' expectations and writers' purposes (Composition 2 Outcomes)	Students will learn to read closely and critically and to analyze the purpose, audience, format, and conventions in varied types of writing Students will learn to name, describe, analyze and apply basic concepts and principles in various disciplines and professions Students will understand how writing and citing conventions vary in different disciplines and professions
2.2 Genres are Enacted by Writers and Readers (Hart-Davidson, 2015, p. 137)	PLO 2 (Rhetoric): Select and apply the appropriate conventions of personal, academic, or professional forms of expression	5) Implement strategies to edit their work according to genre and disciplinary conventions such as arrangement, language use, mechanics, or documentation style (Composition 1 Outcomes)	Students will learn to read closely and critically and to analyze the purpose, audience, format, and conventions in varied types of writing Students will understand how writing and citing conventions vary in different disciplines and professions
2.3 Writing Is a Way of Enacting Disciplinarity (Lerner, 2015, p. 140)	PLO 2 (Rhetoric): Select and apply the appropriate conventions of personal, academic, or professional forms of expression	1) Compose in more than one genre by responding to rhetorical situations and genre conventions according to readers' expectations and writers' purposes (Composition 2 Outcomes)	Students will understand how writing and citing conventions vary in different disciplines and professions Students will learn to name, describe, analyze and apply basic concepts and principles in various disciplines and professions

Note. UC Davis program learning outcomes are from UC Davis University Writing Program (2019); UC Merced program learning outcomes are from UC Merced Karen Merritt Writing Program, 2019; UC Santa Cruz program learning outcomes are from UC Santa Cruz Writing Program (2019); UC Karen Merritt Writing Program (2019).

A central threshold concept, for instance, is "Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity" (Roozen, 2015), which posits that because writing is a form of communication, it necessarily requires writers to engage with others and to consider their audience, the intended outcomes, and the social contexts in which their work and words are situated. Threshold sub-concepts associated with this concept, including "Writing is a Knowledge-Making Activity" (Estrem, 2015), "Writing Addresses, Invokes, and/or Generates Audiences" (Lunsford, 2015a) and "Writing Expresses and Shares Meaning to be Reconstructed by the Reader" (Bazerman, 2015b) each build on these foundations and highlight how writing creates social activity and social engagement by generating dialogue and the exchange of ideas. These threshold concepts and sub-concepts are key ways of thinking about writing that inform both the research and disciplinary practices established by well-known researchers in the field such as Charles Bazerman and Andrea Lunsford, and as such, represent the ways of thinking and doing that writing instructors and students are widely encouraged to adopt because of the practices' centrality to the field's work. By using threshold concepts as a guiding framework with which to conceptualize their own writing and writing processes in composition classes, students can arguably build approaches that more closely approximate the actual disciplinary practices and principles of writing studies. In turn, they can move away from trying to meet the discrete, skills-based learning outcomes that are conceptually distinct from disciplinary principles, and instead, can focus on strengthening their own engagement with the questions, ways of thinking, and ways of doing that writing specialists agree are more generative for student learning and writing performance. Threshold concepts that push students to consider writing in the context of knowledge-making, audience engagement, and the reconstruction of meaning give students the space to consider writing as a dynamic activity capable of having a real impact in the world, unlike learning outcomes which writing experts argue are too decontextualized and product-driven because they are conceived of and implemented within a managerial framework.

73

Despite the field's attempts to distance itself from the restrictions of learning outcomes, however, we can see that many of the skills-based program learning outcomes in the UC Merced, UC Santa Cruz, and UC Davis writing programs continue to be indistinguishable from the intent and expected outcomes of threshold concepts and sub-concepts. UC Merced, for instance, expects its students to be able to "select and apply the appropriate conventions of personal, academic, or professional forms of expression" and to "synthesize diverse perspectives through collaboration in academic discourse communities" once they have completed the sequence of entry-level writing courses in the program (UC Merced Karen Merritt Writing Program, 2019). UC Santa Cruz expects their students to be able to "identify and use rhetorical concepts (such as audience, purpose, context, or genre) to write about a variety of texts" and to be able to "use strategies such as response, analysis, interpretations, or critique to produce writing that draws connections between texts and student writers' perspectives" (UC Santa Cruz Writing Program, 2019). Each of these course learning outcomes focuses on the importance of selecting the appropriate conventions for the appropriate audience in order to generate specific meanings or knowledge that can, in turn, be taken up by and responded to by a reader or audience member. The specific language and terms that UC Merced and UC Santa Cruz use to describe the types of social interactions they expect students to engage in through their writing differ from the terms used to explain threshold concepts. For instance, UC Merced uses the term "academic discourse communities" to describe what threshold concepts call "audience." Similarly, UC Santa Cruz uses the phrase "draws connections between texts and writers' perspectives" to describe the threshold concept of "writing as social and rhetorical activity" while UC Merced refers to this as the ability to "synthesize diverse perspectives through collaboration." The result is the same: in both cases, we can see that the conceptual nature of threshold concepts can in fact easily be transformed into the decontextualized and skills-based learning outcomes that writing programs use to measure students' ability to use, apply, and

demonstrate accurate understandings of these writing studies conventions. By simply using key words from threshold sub-concepts to define the specific practices and skills they believe students must reproduce to reflect their mastery of disciplinary practices and ideologies, writing programs can quickly turn conceptual threshold concepts into measurable outcomes and methods through a simple act of transposition and word association. Threshold sub-concepts that focus on audience, such as "Writing Addresses, Invokes, and/or Creates *Audiences,*" become learning outcomes such as "identify and use rhetorical concepts (such as *audience*, *purpose*, *context*, or *genre*) to analyze and write about a variety of texts" or "students will learn to read closely and critically and to analyze the *purpose, audience, format, and conventions in varied types of writing*" (emphasis added). By transposing "audience" into a learning outcome and identifying the concepts associated with audience — purpose, context, genre, conventions, format, types of writing, and more — writing programs can turn concepts into measurable skills. The extent to which students accurately use and apply the notions of audience, purpose, context, genre, and convention can, in turn, be used to gauge students' level of mastery over the skill. The perceived ontological differences between threshold concepts and assessment-driven learning outcomes are thus quite minimal: threshold concepts might commonly be framed as disciplinary practices and processes that do fundamentally different work than traditional learning outcomes because they challenge both skills-based work and the administrative investment in product-based assessment. Yet, both ultimately share the same expectation: that students will learn to account for audience, purpose, context, genres, ways of conceptualizing, and more *as those in the discipline do*, and will, in turn, write papers that reflect their ability to reproduce these familiar disciplinary practices. Both are, in effect, heavily invested in the reproduction of convention and rely on those who are already in positions of power (e.g., well-published researchers, and department and university administrators) to define which conventions, principles, genres, and disciplinary frameworks are the most important for students to be able to recognize and reproduce.

The assumption that these core principles of composition studies are conceptually more useful to students because they are authentic to the field's disciplinary practices and processes means that writing instructors are now increasingly turning to threshold concepts to structure their courses and pedagogical practices. They do so in hopes of moving away from the administrative and assessment-driven practices that they associate with learning outcomes, and so they can help students understand what writing experts and specialists know to be true about writing and writing performance based on their experience and the growing body of empirical research and knowledge within the field. To be clear, the move to adopt threshold concepts in composition programs has been beneficial for students as far as opening more opportunities for them to situate their work within the cohesive framework of disciplinary practices. Since the publication of *Naming What We Know* in 2015, many writing instructors at UC Merced have assigned this text to their students to read alongside their regular curriculum, thus giving students the opportunity to link the skills they are learning for each assignment and essay to the foundational threshold concepts that structure the field. As students learn how to develop their rhetorical analysis skills, for instance, they can simultaneously read about how writing experts and researchers understand writing as a social activity that both creates and engages audiences for different purposes and can begin to locate their own rhetorical analysis within larger conversations in the discipline about writing, audience, and communicating meaning to readers. Unlike learning outcomes, which offer little disciplinary context as to *why* they matter, threshold concepts as presented in *Naming What We Know* offer students a cohesive and multi-layered framework with which to understand the specific task or assignment they are working on — one that allows them to connect their assignments to the larger goals and work of the field of writing studies.

Yet, the nearly identical language and outcomes-based goals of both learning outcomes and threshold concepts (despite claims to the contrary) suggest that prioritizing threshold

concepts over learning outcomes does not necessarily solve the underlying problem if threshold concepts in fact reproduce the same disciplinary values as learning outcomes, and in so doing, (re)standardizes writing instruction and curricula at the expense of those who have already historically been marginalized within the field. This is especially problematic, given the current interest in bringing students' varied experiences, histories, and identities (Blake Yancey, 2015b; Lunsford, 2015b) into writing classes as a threshold concept that benefits students of color and works towards diversity and inclusion (Fenstermaker, Koehler, Alonso, et al., 2019). These efforts to transform underrepresented student experiences into threshold concepts seem to ignore how threshold concepts reinscribe disciplinary practices and ways of thinking that have historically prevented underrepresented and marginalized students from bringing in their voices, identities, and experiences to change the field. Indeed, the prevailing sentiment among the contributors to *Naming What We Know* (Adler-Kassner & Wardle's, 2015) is that, in order to construct their disciplinary and professional identities, students must "use writing in ways members of their discipline do" and "engage with others in their disciplinary communities in ways that demonstrate that they understand the work these people do and how to communicate with them, *as one of them*" (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015, p. 74, emphasis added). Such an approach predicates student membership in the field on their ability to demonstrate conformity with discourse conventions. Furthermore, it reconfirms the persistent message throughout the volume that students are "nonexperts" who require the "experts" — the well-known and widely-published researchers and practitioners who were specifically chosen based on their preeminence in the field — to identify, explain, "translat[e] and refram[e]" the thirty-seven threshold concepts into language the students can understand (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015, p. 73). Efforts to center discussions of students' prior experiences (Lunsford, 2015b) and their varied histories, processes, and identities (Blake Yancey, 2015b) acknowledge the diversity of student backgrounds and how this shapes writing as a situated practice. However, in the context of

77

threshold concepts, these efforts focus largely on having students bring their prior writing-based experiences and familiarity with disciplinary genres or forms to reproduce and reinforce the legitimacy of "race-neutral" conventions and genres. The expectation is that writers must learn to balance their unique practices (what Blake Yancey describes as writing for the individual) with the discipline-specific practices of writing (what Blake Yancey calls writing for the social and conventional): in doing, they will learn to recognize that their prior knowledge and experiences, and specifically their writing experiences with genre and form, are often not even appropriate for the rhetorical situation they find themselves in (Lunsford, 2015b). In these contexts, efforts to use threshold concepts to structure equity and inclusion initiatives are problematic, as underrepresented student experiences, backgrounds, and knowledge are valued within the field's threshold concepts only to the extent that they help students to reproduce prevailing disciplinary practices, outcomes, and ways of thinking — all of which have historically disenfranchised students of color. Student experiences and knowledge are rarely seen as valuable in their own right, nor are they seen as critical for helping students to challenge — and transform — standard disciplinary frameworks and ideologies altogether.

Asao Inoue's recent work on antiracist writing assessment ecologies (Inoue, 2015) and labor-based grading contracts (Inoue, 2019) attempts to expose the structural inequities underlying the same disciplinary practices that structure threshold concepts. Inoue specifically notes that because many writing programs, assignments, and activities are tied to dominant discourse and narrowly defined and predetermined learning outcomes (Gallagher, 2012) applied to all students, they are predicated on reproducing (whether intentionally or not) what he calls the dominant White racial middle-class *habitus* (Inoue, 2015; 2019) — the tendency for whiteness to structure writing classroom pedagogies, forms of assessment, discourses, and expectations. This dominant white racial middle-class habitus reproduces and maintains racial, economic, and social inequities (Inoue, 2015). In the case of Fresno State, for instance, Inoue (2015) argues that

the structural biases built into the university's writing placement exam prompt and assessment tools disproportionately categorize students of color as remedial, where 48.7% of African American students, 54.3% of Mexican American students, and 67.5% of Asian American (the majority being Hmong American) students are placed into remedial English classes compared to only 23.6% of white students (Inoue, 2015, p. 34-36). These assessment-based biases appear in other forms — most notably in the persistently lower scores that students of color are given on their final portfolios in Fresno State's summer reading programs (Inoue, 2012), and in the higher failure rates among black, Latinx, and Hmong students in all writing courses in the department (Inoue, 2015, p. 52). As a result, Inoue (2019) advocates for using labor-based grading contracts in composition classes, where students are graded solely on the amount of work they do for the course instead of the "quality" of what they produce, in a concerted effort to challenge the dominant language discourses that structure university writing programs' conventional assessment instruments and definitions of what counts in "good" writing (such as content, organization, structure, clarity in language, mechanics, and style). Labor-based grading contracts shift assessment practices from instructor- and discipline-specific notions of "quality" that are invariably determined by dominant standards and instead privilege practices that redefine writing according to labor and students' ability to reflect on their labor. They specifically encourage students to focus on questions such as, "how much am I laboring?", "how am I laboring and what does it offer me?", and "what is the nature of my labor and what does it offer me?" (Inoue, 2019, p. 107). Inoue argues that through this focus on labor and the process of privileging labor over mastering standardized skills, students of color can begin to take control over their work and engage more fully in the process of learning how to write (p. 143, 150) without being subjected to racially biased standards and quality-based hierarchies that unfairly penalize them for not growing up in environments where they were exposed to dominant literacy practices (Inoue, 2015). Grading contracts are thus an attempt to create a space where hard work actually

79

pays off. They eliminate as many of the structural inequities and forms of racialization in writing assessment practices and tools as possible, including the dominant language discourses and literacy practices that skills- and quality-based assessment rubrics prioritize. Moreover, they transform assessment into a system that tracks *how* students work in order to open opportunities for them to labor to learn instead of working endlessly in a system where their efforts will not change the racialized standards by which their work is always assessed.

Inoue's work importantly names the racist standards and ways of thinking about writing that structure both writing assessment and student success in university composition courses, and in this sense, has rightly been embraced by many writing instructors across the nation. His publications on labor-based grading contracts and the dominant white racial middle-class habitus have pushed writing program instructors to discuss what it means to decolonize writing curricula (Ruiz, 2019) and to recognize white supremacy and white privilege in the field (Inoue, March 2019). Inoue's powerful keynote address at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (Inoue, March 2019) explicitly called out the white language supremacy and white racial bias that structure composition studies and writing classes. He linked racism in composition to grading standards that continue to promote white language supremacy, thus forcing audience members who continued to rely on these standards to confront their unconscious investment in, complicity with, and ongoing benefits from racial inequities in the field. The contentious discussions his address raised within the Writing Program Administrators listerv soon after the conference speak to the impact his work is already having in the field, from offering instructors a new language and platform with which to discuss these issues, to inspiring transformations in not only *what* instructors do in their classes but also *how* they reflect on their work, privilege, and assumptions in order to do antiracist work in their teaching and research. Thanks to the spaces that Inoue's keynote address (Inoue, March, 2019) opened, instructors and researchers alike have begun to engage in frank discussions about racism, whiteness, white

privilege, and the silencing of students of color. In doing so, they have begun to expose deep ideological divisions between members of the field that include conflicting views of what writing instruction should do, whom it is accountable to, and what it would mean for the field (and individual instructors' and researchers' sense of self in the field) to shift the terms of discussion from "diversity" to "problematizing Whiteness," from "assessment" to "White habits of judgment," and from "my comfort" to "their pain, safety, and health." The discussions that Inoue's keynote and his publications have inspired have shown how deep-rooted racial power structures and racial privilege are in writing studies; yet, these attempts to name the problematic and racist realities of the field have also opened important opportunities for students, scholars, and instructors of color to come together and work towards change in new ways with a clearer understanding of what is at stake.

Yet, this work, like threshold concepts, is not without its problems. For all of the possibilities that labor-based grading contracts open up and the realities that they name, labor-based grading contracts only focus on assessment practices, which overlook equally problematic elements of course design that have the potential to reinscribe the very forms of racialization, dominant discourses, and disciplinary norms that labor-based grading contracts are supposed to address. In their attempt to prioritize, track, and reward students for their attention to labor and process, labor-based grading contracts avoid reinforcing dominant discourse and white racial habitus via *assessment*, but invariably end up *prescribing process* by imposing instructor-based expectations on what counts as the "right" processes for a particular genre of writing. This approach may restrict the kind of work that students do to challenge normative genre expectations in the field. Inoue's (2019) sample set of labor instructions for students' personal narrative drafts, for instance, meticulously documents everything students must do to earn full credit for 230 minutes of labor on the paper (p. 340-344), from which activities they should engage in before, during, and after they write their drafts to outlining which questions and the

number of examples he would like them to focus on in each segment of their process. Students are given guidelines for how much time to spend on each part of the process — twenty minutes for reading preparatory handouts and articles, three minutes for engaging in mindful breathing practices before they start working, twenty minutes for planning their narrative, one minute to post a Slack message about their work, etc. — and when in the labor process they should work on particular sections of their papers. The close attention to breaking down each part of the writing process componentially both by task and time may very well ensure that there is absolute transparency in how students are expected to labor for 230 minutes — a commitment that is also evident in the labor logs and reflection journals that students are required to fill out to quantify and document their labor processes. However, it also means that Inoue's instructions read as a manual in which process is reduced to a set of standardized, procedural steps assumed to work for everyone. Here, the act of laboring in prescribed ways and for specific amounts of time is literally the end goal of the assignments. This approach is arguably no different than the practice of using dominant disciplinary forms and standards to structure assignments in ways that have the potential to disenfranchise students of color: although students might be writing a personal narrative in a class structured around labor-based grading contracts, it is a narrative whose process, structure, and ultimate purpose have already been determined in advance and which assumes that dutifully responding to sets of conventional questions and following prescribed steps are sufficient for generating what counts as narrative. In labor-based grading contracts, there is little space for instructors and students to recognize that the students themselves often are well-positioned to determine which processes, questions, issues, and approaches would best serve their own interests, goals, purposes, and ways of thinking or doing. These labor instructions, for instance, ask students to connect their goals to course goals in much the same way that students at UC Merced are expected to align their writing to course learning outcomes and university principles through the common diversity prompt. Rather than

using expert disciplinary practices and whiteness discourses to determine assessment and evaluation criteria, however, labor-based grading contracts' ways of conceptualizing what "counts" as narrative or genre *are now simply built into the work process itself*, where students learn, through adherence to quantifiable labor logs and labor instructions that prescribe process, how to replicate the same racialized logics of process and procedure that constitute membership in the discipline. These pedagogical and process-based models may thus offer alternatives to familiar practices in the discipline, but are still shaped by dominant ideologies and expectations that reproduce the very forms of product- and outcomes-driven work that they presumably were designed to challenge.

The steps students are expected to follow in these labor-based contracts do not deviate significantly from the steps prescribed in the very writing handbooks that are invested in reproducing the white racial habitus and racially inequitable forms of assessment that Inoue critiques. In *Contemporary and Classic Arguments*, a writing handbook commonly used in university-level writing courses, for example, Barnet and Bedau (2015) similarly recommend that students begin their writing process by freewriting for five to six minutes, listing down key words, diagramming their ideas, asking questions about their topic, and building a thesis or main point before they begin to write the body paragraphs of their paper. These are all procedures that, like Inoue's labor instructions, are common to the discipline (as seen in many other handbooks such as Booth, Columb, & Williams, 2008; Eschholz, Rosa, & Clark, 2013; Swales & Feak, 2004 and more) and accompanied by extensive checklists for what students need to consider, ask themselves, and include as they are writing and revising. For students who may not know how to begin their writing process or who may be unaware that academic writing requires that they build and develop complex arguments by analyzing evidence, these guidelines offer a clear and manageable starting point that can be a useful way to build students' confidence and their understanding of disciplinary conventions. Yet, these guided activities notably never

acknowledge or ask students of color to use their own rich experiences, knowledge, and ways of thinking about issues to inform their work and to shape their work processes, even though all students bring perspectives and experiences to their reading and writing that are valuable sources of analysis and critique. Instead, process and procedures in Barnet and Bedau's handbook and others (e.g., Booth, Columb, & Williams, 2008; Eschholz, Rosa, & Clark, 2013; Swales & Feak, 2004) follow colorblind and discipline-specific logic, priorities, and procedures not only assumed to be widely applicable and prescribable across all student populations regardless of context, but that also inspire the very threshold concepts, program learning outcomes, and forms of quality-based assessment that Inoue argues have systematically maintained structural racism in writing programs. None of the carefully pre-packaged thematic readings and resources that Barnet and Bedau (2015) offer to students to help them write about diversity and multiculturalism from multiple viewpoints acknowledge that the very students who read this handbook might have more extensive first-hand knowledge and more complex ways of understanding racism and inequities than any of the materials provided. When forced to work within the constraints of reading and writing processes that reflect disciplinary norms, students of color's ability to contribute new ideas and methodologies may never be recognized or valued because they fail to align with the prescribed and formulaic processes that structure the composition field. Labor-based grading contracts may ensure that underrepresented students will no longer be penalized or assessed based on the dominant racialized discourses that shape standard assessment practices. Yet, because grading contracts still require students to follow detailed labor instructions that are nearly identical to the conventional procedures found in most learning outcomes and writing handbooks, students will still work to produce the same logics and genres of the field by following step-driven processes designed to generate products recognizable to experts in the field.

84

Inoue's labor-based grading contracts are increasingly popular among writing instructors because they promise to eliminate assessment-based racial inequities and white language supremacy (Inoue, 2019). However, the ways that these labor contracts continue to be influenced by and reproduce the dominant logics and disciplinary practices of writing studies at the expense of underrepresented students should not be minimized. Both threshold concepts and labor-based grading contracts do acknowledge the diversity in student experiences, and labor-based grading contracts explicitly name and attempt to dismantle racism in writing assessment. However, neither actually sees underrepresented students of color's experiences and knowledge as central to informing the work the *students* are trying to do, nor do they consider student knowledge as a critical foundation for reconceptualizing what it could mean to write in a composition class. Within the current trends that shape university-level writing instruction, students of color's experiences and ways of doing are either not used at all to inform pedagogy or practice (as in the case of labor-based contracts) or are framed as largely inapplicable due to their perceived irrelevance in most rhetorical and discipline-specific situations in academia (as in the case of threshold concepts). As such, students' experiences, methodologies, and forms of analysis are almost never used to challenge these well-established standards or practices, nor are they used to build new disciplinary ideologies and conceptual frameworks. In cases where students highlight disconnects between their lived experiences and the restrictive conventions in writing courses, their work is often depoliticized and reabsorbed by the normative curriculum and ideologies that already structure writing programs and instructor pedagogy — an example of what Apple (1990) describes as the deliberate underemphasis of conflict to prioritize consensus in order to maintain the hidden curriculum in education (e.g., the norms and values built into education curricula that are taken as neutral and natural).

Inoue (2019) himself, for instance, describes a reflective assignment where his students were asked to consider how "habits of Whiteness" (Inoue, 2019, p. 278) shaped the feedback

that they offer to each other in peer review. He notes that one student, who had written an unconventional research essay draft and who received unexpected feedback in response to her draft, began to question the original assignment directions, which specified that students must include three sources of evidence in their work. It is important to recognize that students were given the space to use their own experiences to name "White habits" in writing courses, to discuss the limitations of these dominant ideologies and expectations, and to notice the impacts on their own work: when given the opportunity to use their knowledge and experiences as the basis for critical analysis, students were able identify and deconstruct the artificiality of common disciplinary standards and practices quickly and powerfully. Yet, much of the transformative potential of this moment was lost in the labor-based approach Inoue used to respond to this unexpected situation. At the pivotal moment when his student expressed concerns with the assignment parameters, Inoue responded by modifying the brainstorming worksheet table his students were filling out as part of their peer review session to reflect the student's interest in posing questions. The original worksheet table allowed students to note things like whiteness traits in their peers' drafts, how writers "manage[d] or treat[ed]" evidence in the draft, and how the structure of the draft impacted the reader (p. 283). After Inoue's revision to the worksheet table, his students could now, like their classmate had, pose questions in their peer review worksheet tables based on their analysis. In this situation, students had been using their experiential knowledge to question accepted norms and to challenge blind conformity to institutional processes and ideological assumptions, including Inoue's labor instructions and his dominant assumption that this paper needed three sources of evidence. As such, the decision to use students' insights as an opportunity to restructure a worksheet overlooked a potential opportunity to use students' experiential knowledge to instead rewrite and transform conventional standards and processes for writing papers. While Inoue's response acknowledged the importance of the students' insights by formalizing their questions into a new column in the

peer review worksheet brainstorming table, his decision to turn the students' concerns into another step in a formalist, procedure-driven worksheet was a missed opportunity for the class. This instead could have been a moment for the class to begin co-constructing new ways of conceptualizing writing altogether based on the limitations of traditional disciplinary practice that their dialogues were bringing to the surface. Turning critique into another measurable step in a structured exercise (e.g., peer review worksheet table) already familiar to the discipline arguably over-simplified the considerably more complex processes by which students were beginning to recognize the problems with writing instruction. The traditional compare/contrast structures of a labor-based, brainstorming worksheet facilitates the ready absorption of students' critiques into the very formalized structures and step-driven practices they were critiquing, and in doing so, reinforces the stability of these structures and their underlying adherence to prevailing forms, processes, and logics. This not to say that Inoue's response was wrong. Rather, the all too common practice in writing programs of transforming student critiques and analytical processes into reproducible steps in a worksheet reflects the extent to which established procedures still dominate the field and instructors' understandings of what counts as an appropriate outcome or labor process. Even as instructors recognize and attempt to change these "habits of Whiteness" that structure their work, the perceived neutrality and objectivity of activities and practices make it difficult to break away fully from dominant ways of thinking and doing in the field.

Conclusion

In July 2019, UC Merced's Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion hired its first Associate Chancellor and Chief Diversity Officer in what would be the first of many steps the university would undertake in order to diversify its administrative ranks and move towards building a campus that would both reflect the diversity of its students and staff and be

accountable to their needs. The chief diversity officer's first task was to embark on a year-long

series of structured listening tours and surveys during the 2019-2020 academic year with

members of the campus community and residents in the city of Merced in order to gather

information about their experiences and to use this data as the foundation of a campus-wide

strategic framework and strategic equity, diversity, and inclusion plan for the university. Titled

"2020 & Beyond: Building & Thinking Forward," the listening tour was structured to operate

within an equity and justice-minded framework in order to disrupt existing power hierarchies

and structural inequities in the university's operating structure: over the course of two surveys

and four listening tours, the equity office primarily listened to members of the campus

community share their experiences in response to the sessions' three key themes — "Building

Belonging," "Building Excellence," and "Building Together" (Alnagar & Matos, 2020). The

listening tour was a concerted effort to ensure that the campus's future plans for equity and

inclusion would be informed by and grounded in the lived experiences and recommendations of

students, faculty, staff, and city residents. This year-long effort culminated in the formation of a

strategic framework and plan whose central visions of "people first" and "anti-oppression and

liberation for all" (Alnagar & Matos, 2020, p. 13) were to be met by the equity office's promise to

dismantle systemic and structural inequity within the university by raising critical consciousness

and developing transformative practices through the principles of community, access,

transparency, inclusion, diversity, equity, and accountability (BobCAT IDEAs). A key component

of the anticipated success of this strategic framework and the BobCAT IDEAs strategic plan

was the unanticipated formation of the People First Workgroup. This group originally arose in

response to the COVID-19 pandemic in Merced, but its charge to assess and respond to the

needs of the most vulnerable members of the campus community is expected to continue

playing a critical role in the coming years as the equity office embarks on its long-term efforts to

eradicate systemic racism and injustices from the campus. To date, the People First Workgroup

has conducted two surveys to collect data about how the pandemic has affected the campus community's experiences with campus resources, changing working conditions, economic challenges, connecting to and finding support within the campus community, and changing instructional responsibilities (Alagnar, Ramirez Loyola, & Danube, 2020). The workgroup has presented its findings at town halls that promote open and ongoing dialogues among students, staff, and faculty.

The hope for collective freedom and community-based collaboration that informs UC Merced's strategic framework and strategic plan speaks to two of the consistent contributions that diversity, equity, and inclusion work continues to make possible in universities: the recognition that there are significant shortcomings in the university that continue to affect students of color disproportionately, and the understanding that the process of removing the institutional barriers to equitable access in education requires collective dialogues both within and outside of the university so administrators can learn how various stakeholders experience these inequities. As universities and fields such as composition studies work to build institutions that are more grounded in underrepresented student voices and their lived experiences, their equity plans exhibit slow but steady shifts from administrator-controlled, top-down work towards plans that are increasingly open to ground-up work such as the People First Workgroup that start with the needs of the most vulnerable members of the university and surrounding communities. These efforts open opportunities for universities and academic programs to expose administrative practices and policies that regularly place students of color in vulnerable positions during their time at the university, and in doing so, to reshape the conceptual frameworks that structure equity initiatives as well.

These visions for collaboration and dismantling systemic racism in academia through dialogue and working groups open critical opportunities for change because they now focus on student and community well-being. Yet, even as they create the space for new possibilities, they

also recall the long history of the institutionalization of black studies and ethnic studies programs and the unfulfilled promises and visions that the student movements fought for. Equity and inclusion initiatives and chief diversity officers are, like multicultural literary courses, the legacies of the strategic suppression of many of the more militant actions and ideologies that drove student movements in the 1960s and that threatened established university procedures and practices. These initiatives are still invested in the disciplinary practices and foundational premises of the university that contribute to structural racism, even though the administrators who carry out these initiatives may have learned from the mistakes of multicultural education. Equity plans such as UC Merced's are still structured by notions of excellence, representation, and structural change that lead to diversification through numerical representation. Although UC Merced's equity office has adopted community-and listening-based approaches in order to include a multitude of stakeholder voices to shape its strategic plan designs, the plan still overlooks the urgent need to overhaul the disciplinary practices and learning outcomes within departments and classrooms that actively maintain students of color's ongoing exclusion and disenfranchisement. The structured sharing of individual experience through listening tours offers valuable insight into daily lived experiences of oppression and racial subordination within the university setting as well as opportunities for students to assume a more prominent role in equity work than previously granted; however, within the framework of equity and inclusion offices whose charge does not include reimagining institutional and disciplinary practices, sharing individual experiences have historically led equity teams to develop workshops, programs, and activities that only take individual transformation and the heightened critical consciousness of the individual as the barometer of the university's commitment to and excellence in equity and inclusion. The perception that structural change can be achieved through the accumulation of individual knowledge and reflected through campus climate and satisfaction surveys means that equity initiatives regularly ignore the critical role that seemingly

neutral disciplinary practices like learning outcomes and threshold concepts play in reproducing racial power hierarchies. In measuring changes at the campus-wide level via representation and aggregated campus climate data, equity initiatives continue to fail to assess critically and to recognize the problematic racial dimensions of the many disciplinary practices, methodologies, learning outcomes, and conceptual frameworks that are regularly deployed at the departmental and disciplinary levels. Although the racial inequities that they reproduce are less visible compared to curricular content or the lack of minority representation in university ranks, the disciplinary practices that structure classroom pedagogies, ideologies, and learning objectives allow writing instructors to continue subscribing to the same exclusionary ideologies that comprise the foundations of their field under the guise of neutrality and objectivity without ever having to question or examine the underlying racial dimensions, premises, and outcomes of these practices.

While writing instructors and programs within the UC system have made concerted efforts to change their curriculum by introducing diversity prompts, diversity units, and diversity learning outcomes, these initiatives operate under the assumption that addressing structural shortcomings only require minimal modifications or additions rather than the deeper transformation of the flawed disciplinary practices and conceptual frameworks from which these initiatives emerge and upon which instructors' work in the classroom is based. The increasingly popular practice of sidestepping the white habitus of traditional writing assessment through labor-based grading contracts attempts to address these shortcomings by explicitly naming and removing the assessment standards and conventions that reproduce whiteness and reinforce hierarchies in academia at the expense of students of color. Yet, the shift in focus from meeting disciplinary standards to celebrating student labor and process conveniently ignores the fact that fields such as composition studies have historically prescribed process and procedure in order to maintain control over how knowledge is constructed: methods and

procedures for constructing arguments, for conducting research, for analyzing texts, and more already structure standard disciplinary practices and are in part what allow the field of composition studies to define the scope of its work and membership in the field. As such, the tendency to look to labor as an antiracist alternative to racist disciplinary standards ignores the ways that disciplinary methodologies have always been formulated to restrict what "counts" as relevant knowledge, to exclude ways of doing that fail to conform to recognized and acceptable forms and practices in the field, and to control who is considered "worthy" of producing knowledge. In short, neither the disciplinary practices that, as Crenshaw et al. (2019) put it, "enable racial structures and inhibit the means to dismantle them" (p. 13), nor the learning outcomes to which they are tied change significantly under equity plans because they are consistently overlooked as critical sites for the systematic production of racialization, racial power structures, and exclusion in academic disciplines and in the classroom. As students, faculty, and administrators continue to subscribe to the belief in the integrity of academia's underlying ideological foundations, standards, and methods, their efforts to remedy racial inequities through labor-based practices and diversity initiatives largely reinforce existing disciplinary conceptual frameworks and reproduce the seemingly neutral and objective processes by which entire disciplines have historically racialized and excluded students of color ideologically, conceptually, and methodologically.

Chapter Two: The Establishment and Reconceptualization of Academic Writing in

Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley

Min-Zhan Lu (1999a, 1999b) reminds us that while the dominant academic discourses and literacies in the field of writing studies may seem natural and immutable, they are in fact the product of "specific historical circumstance resulting from the unequal distribution of social power as a condition which [students] must recognize but can also call into question and change" (Lu, 1999b, p. 114). There is a long history of students and faculty of color challenging the disciplinary frameworks and ideologies that structure standardized learning outcomes and pedagogies in academic writing classes; yet, these rich histories of students of color leading the charge to reenvision and redefine the work and politics of academic writing have largely been rewritten or left out of the dominant narrative of composition studies altogether, making it difficult for both instructors and students to see the potential to transform these seemingly "*timeless* linguistic law[s]" (Lu, 1999b, p. 114). Recovering these histories and rewriting the history of composition studies from the perspectives of those who have sought to challenge the racist ideologies of the field are critical for understanding the hidden politics in what seems to be a neutral, skills-based field. Moreover, documenting these histories of student-led resistance offers crucial examples of different visions for the work of academic writing, where what "counts" as relevant literacies and knowledge are not defined by the field itself but rather by students' and their communities' material needs and realities in and outside of academia. The field's prevailing frameworks and practices are in fact always under threat as students of color see the disconnection between the analytical skills that they recognize they need in order to respond to urgent problems in society and the conventional procedures they are expected to master.

This chapter examines the overlooked history of how students and faculty of color in university writing classes have fought to redefine the work of academic writing in higher

education. The chapter begins by looking critically at the work and legacy of Mina Shaughnessy, whose seminal *Errors and Expectations* (Shaughnessy, 1977) framed grammatical instruction as a form of access and empowerment for students of color and, in the process of doing so, rewrote and suppressed City College of New York students' demands for an education that was relevant to their lives and communities. The chapter then examines how African American and Asian American students at the University of California, Berkeley fought to establish and control their own writing classes in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It documents how the UC Berkeley Afro-American Studies, Asian Studies, and La Raza Studies divisions reconceptualized writing instruction in order to connect it to larger movements for social transformation and to help students develop their sense of self-identity and self-determination. As such, the early history of these ethnic studies programs offers important insights into what it means to design writing classes to serve the needs and futures of students and communities of color. To make visible the limitations of current equity and inclusion initiatives, this chapter looks at the largely suppressed and forgotten history of the fights led by both students and faculty of color at UC Berkeley to challenge the rhetoric and impacts of remediation on students of color. Student-initiated movements at UC Berkeley to redesign writing classes and to house them in Ethnic Studies programs offered a starkly different way of conceptualizing what it meant for a university writing program to work towards racial justice and social transformation for both students and communities of color.

"Towards a Culturally Relevant Pedagogy": Student Movements to Reconceptualize Literacy, and the Rewriting of Composition History

In her description of a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy for black students, Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) establishes that the foundations of a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy are not so much about the specific course content as they are about *how* instructors

94

reconceptualize the relationship between themselves and others. To Ladson-Billings, culturally relevant pedagogy is about social relations and knowledge: how do instructors ensure that their teaching will have material impacts "on their students' lives, the welfare of the community, and unjust social arrangements" (p. 474)? Underlying her theory for culturally relevant pedagogy is the understanding that in order to transform the conceptual frameworks needed to do this work, instructors and students alike must begin to ask fundamentally different questions of the work they are doing. These questions ask students to confront the sociopolitical dimensions of their work and to engage in ways that draw from their lived experiences (rather than from purely academic perspectives) so they can generate new theories and conceptual frameworks about knowledge formation. When discussing the characteristics of culturally relevant pedagogy, for instance, Ladson-Billings focuses not so much on *which* curriculum, content, or learning outcomes facilitates the formation of culturally relevant pedagogies as she does on *how* instructors push students to challenge, critique, and critically analyze standard school reading materials. She highlights the benefits when instructors ask questions that encourage students to use their own expertise to analyze how knowledge is formed and for what purposes it is used. In these contexts, students are pushed to consider why investigating to learn might be important and to question the limits of knowledge presented as fact. More importantly, however, these questions push students to use their critical analysis to build alternative ways of knowing and responding. This sort of question-posing refuses merely to confirm knowledge or to mechanize processes of formulating understandings, but instead always seeks to build critical understandings of how knowledge is generated and operates in lived, political contexts. In these ways, it is reminiscent of Robert Moses's work with The Algebra Project (Moses, Kamii, & Swap, 1989), which is similarly premised on the belief that to challenge the inequities in black students' access to math and science literacy, instructors, administrators, parents, and communities must move beyond basic questions of curricular reform and inclusion. Instead,

Moses, Kamii and Swap (1989) argue that they must instead ask questions that force stakeholders to think about literacy as a larger political issue for students and communities of color, with significant social, political, and economic implications in their daily lived experiences. In asking questions about how inequitable access to literacy affects the lives and futures of black students and their communities, both Ladson-Billings (1995) and Moses (1989) force instructors, students, and parents alike to confront the limitations of a curricular- and outcomes-based model of education. Their questions situate inequities in education within a longer history of the unequal distribution of resources along racial and economic lines, thus demonstrating that educational reform often depoliticizes education by ignoring the larger social, political, and lived contexts from which racial and economic inequities in education emerge.

The work and educational theories of Myles Horton (Horton & Jacobs, 2003; Horton & Freire, 1990) serve as a reminder that the kinds of questions the students and their communities are asking and the problems they want to address are more important than instructors' questions. To Horton and other educators who work with students and community members in non-traditional classroom settings, the process of education and social transformation must begin with the people who, because of their lived experiences in their communities, schools, and workplaces, necessarily formulate problems and ways of thinking about these problems differently. Their lived experiences and knowledge necessitate that they work towards visions of social transformation and change that defy the constraints of academic (il)logic, expectation, and ideologies. According to Horton, the people themselves are the experts on the realities of their own situations: they alone know first-hand the forms of oppression they face, the most pressing problems for their communities, and the contexts that are critical for understanding these problems. As such, they are best equipped to ask the kinds of questions that will not only shift how others think about the issues they face, but that will advance meaningful social and material change for their communities. Students at the Center, a writing program and learning community

in New Orleans that engages students in writing-based dialogues and movements to transform their communities and their schools, shares a similar philosophy. Students at the Center makes clear in its founding principles that "students are the most underused resource in any school" (Randels, 2010, p. 52). It thus structures its work around the belief that education for social transformation must begin with students' and community members' knowledge, their ways of seeing, and their understanding of problems so they can "'learn how to identify their own oppression … learn how to voice that and write about it and teach everyone else about it …'" (SAC theater artist, as quoted in Buras, Randels, & ya Salaam, 2010, p. 43). In doing so, students not only take control of their own knowledge, but also design the processes, conceptual frameworks, and tools that will bring into being the structural changes and future they see as critical for their communities and society more broadly (Horton & Jacobs, 2003). Horton reminds us that the questions, analysis, processes, and visions of change developed by those already in positions of power and privilege (even the questions and visions of well-meaning educators) often advance mere *reforms* in an already oppressive system (Horton & Freire, 1990; Horton & Jacobs, 2003) because they are still tied to existing formal education structures. In these situations, marginalized communities are forced to adopt the very ideologies that disenfranchise them and have little space to do the work that most accurately reflect and serve the needs of their communities. Kalamu ya Salaam (2010) writes that most theories about teaching inner-city youth "are predicated on preparing these youth to participate in the mainstream. Such theories never question the sanity of joining in a system that has systematically oppressed and exploited the very youth we are teaching. If preparing them to simply be 'productive citizens' of the status quo is the bottom line of what we do, then we might as well be teaching courses in suicide" (p. 66).

All of these examples speak to the ways in which people's lived experiences are the driving force behind their ability both to recognize the reformist underpinnings of seemingly

progressive initiatives and to conceptualize the problems they are facing in ways that refuse to conform to dominant logics. Because they are the experts of their realities and oppression, they are able to formulate questions that are clear-sighted in their assessments of what the real issues and priorities are and can build deep understandings of how to work towards radical structural change and social transformation (Horton & Freire, 1990, p. 93-94; ya Salaam, 2010). As Horton argues, it is critical for educators to "trust people's ability to move in the direction that will give them more freedom, more justice, a more creative life" (Horton & Jacobs, 2003, p. 186). While the process of education, including critical problem posing, is normally conceived of and practiced as instructor-led and focused on the advancement of the individual student, the foundation of transformative and liberatory education is structured around the recognition that students' and community members' quests for liberation are not only intertwined, but that their questions, experiences, and ability to control their knowledge and futures must be at the center of any educational work that seeks to challenge systemic racial and economic inequities.

Within this context, then, many of the challenges academic writing programs have historically faced in their attempts to remedy the racist ideologies that structure the field can be seen as an issue of uncertainty as to how to put students of color's experiences, questions, and ways of looking at the world at the center of both the writing programs themselves and the agendas that guide their visions for transformation. While there is a long history of students and faculty of color demanding that writing programs in higher education recognize the languages, backgrounds, and literacies of underrepresented student populations (Hoang, 2015; Kynard, 2013; Smitherman, 1974; Smitherman, 1977), writing programs' insistence on maintaining the programmatic, disciplinary, and pedagogical norms of the field as much as possible have meant that historically underrepresented students and their experiences have only been peripherally included in and used to guide changes in field. Though they are rarely acknowledged in official composition and writing studies histories, underrepresented students of color played a critical

role in pressuring college writing faculty to rethink their approaches to education and the teaching of writing (Hoang, 2015; Kynard, 2013) when they fought for Ethnic Studies on college campuses during the late 1960s and early 1970s and demanded a relevant education that would serve their needs and interests. This was particularly the case at City University of New York (CUNY), where black and Puerto Rican student at City College of New York (CCNY) demanded a school of Black and Puerto Rican Studies and a CUNY student body whose racial composition reflected the racial composition of New York City high schools. Their demands eventually led to the open admissions program, which not only forced writing programs to begin focusing more on social issues, but which also notably shaped Mina Shaughnessy's work in writing instruction at CCNY and the eventual publication of her seminal book, *Errors and Expectations* (Shaughnessy, 1977). Her book changed how writing instructors across the nation would look at students of color's languages and written work. Without the student protests and their demands, which exposed the disconnect between the university education they were receiving and the kind of education students believed would be relevant to them and their communities, these curricular and pedagogical changes in composition courses and in writing instructors' perceptions of students of color ostensibly would not have taken place, or would have happened more slowly. Yet, these changes often still reflected institutional interests and illustrated how the institutions would use student demands to serve the academy's largely unchanged objectives, rather than to advance the students' real interests.

Given the heavy influence that *Errors and Expectations* had on classroom instruction and on the field more generally, Shaughnessy's (1977) work is particularly important for understanding how writing programs were able to marginalize and suppress the core of student demands despite instructors' seeming interest in changing their curriculum and pedagogy to serve student interests. Shaughnessy's approach to working with underrepresented students was attentive to students' backgrounds, home languages, and the understanding that language

99

production was rhetorically situated; yet, it was still based on a deficit model firmly entrenched in the misinformed belief that "Standard" English and mastery of academic language and code were key to institutional access for racially subordinated students. In seeking to prioritize and expose the underlying logic of the grammatical errors in remedial student work, Shaughnessy may have helped writing instructors become more sensitive to the challenges multilingual students faced with language in a restricted rhetorical context such as the university. However, her insistence on continuing to correct student grammar — even going so far as to rewrite their work in her book (Shaughnessy, 1977) — in the name of helping students gain the freedom of choice in their language use, problematically erased the political dimensions of students' experiences and their ways of expressing their changing political alignments through their writing (Lu, 1991). Moreover, as Kynard (2013) writes, Shaughnessy's work also ignored the fact that it was political action and protests by black students and communities — not, as Shaughnessy argued, the mastery of "Standard" English — that granted black students the most access to educational institutions in the late 1960s and 1970s (Kynard, 2013; Musgrave, 1971).

In these ways, Shaughnessy's work in fact *rewrote* the politics of student protests and experience by framing error analysis as a form of access and student empowerment. Both Kynard (2013) and Hoang (2015) remind us that this move not only reinforced the assumption that students who came to the university through open admissions programs still needed to assimilate to the institution via their language and writing, but also completely overlooked how students of color were *already* redefining what counted as literacy as they placed their histories, interests, and visions at the center of their demands for change (Hoang, 2015; Kynard, 2013). As Kynard (2013), Hoang (2015), and former San Francisco State College student protester Irene Dea Collier (2019) remind us, student protesters were in fact the authors of new academic programs such as Asian American Studies, Black Studies, Chicano Studies, and Native American Studies. As the people who had to write new ethnic studies curricula and texts and who had to

100

figure out how to ensure the curricula would meet college and university standards so the courses could continue running (Dea Collier, 2019), student protesters had to reconceptualize what a relevant education should be and put into practice their understanding that education needed to be closely tied to racial, social, and economic conditions outside of the classroom (Maeda, 2012). They attempted to find new ways to bring into being programs that would directly respond to and attempt to change the social, political, and economic structures of oppression so students of color could take control of their education and actively participate in transforming their material circumstances (Ferreira, 2003) by going back into their communities as educators and community activists (Dea Collier, 2019). All of these activities and commitments were forms of literacy (Hoang, 2015; Kynard, 2013) that were grounded in students' and their communities' real concerns and realities. These priorities quickly exposed the irrelevance of Shaughnessy's (and by extension, writing studies') ongoing interest in and insistence on focusing on grammar instruction and the "logics" of grammatical error when it came to developing culturally and politically relevant pedagogy, education, and praxis for social and structural change.

Kynard (2013) also reminds us that the integrationist history of writing studies in fact truncates the long history of black college student protests and the protesters' concerted and constant attempts to redefine literacy in the academy. The field's integrationist history locates open admissions at CUNY, student protests in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and Shaughnessy's interventions in writing instruction as the critical moments that presumably initiated the social turn in writing studies. Yet, Kynard reveals that black students were constructing new forms of literacy and rhetoric long before the movements for open admissions and ethnic studies programs. The Long Black Student Movement (Kendi, 2012) extended from the 1920s through the 1960s, and through student protests, introduced new literacies and forms of writing into the academy that were not only deeply political, but situated in social, economic, historical, and

cultural contexts that challenged the skills- and grammar-based notions of writing that structured universities and their writing programs. Black students generated political analysis about the inequities they faced, developed new visions for academic programs and policies that they designed, formulated demands and put them in written form, and constructed new contexts of understanding as they formulated their critical analysis. All were new forms of literacy and writing. Although these activities were not necessarily recognized as such by writing studies and writing programs, Kynard (2013) argues that the analytical and written work that black students produced were the foundation of a decades-long new literacies movement in the academy (Kynard, 2013, p. 32): this literacy movement was not only tied to an "ideological stance for literacy and education in their lives … based on a history that went back to slavery and into emancipation" (Kynard, 2013, p. 34), but was one that would later influence the Black Power movement when black student unions on college campuses became the new sites of writing, literacy, and political thought in the 1960s and 1970s (Kendi, 2012; Kynard, 2013).

The wide popularity and influence of Shaughnessy's work in writing studies has unfortunately meant that students of color's and student protesters' powerful critiques of the university have ultimately been subsumed into the integrationist narrative (Kynard, 2013, p. 156) that writing studies has since adopted as its official history. Because Shaughnessy chose to position both the student activists and the CCNY open admissions students as misunderstood by their instructors but still in need of remediation, their demands, their ways of redefining literacy in the academy, and the lived contexts that shaped their work have unfortunately been strategically rewritten in the official history of writing studies. Kynard (2013) describes this integrationist narrative as a "master script" (p. 171) — one that Kynard explains has documented the history of composition studies as a supposedly linear and seamless transformation from a field that marginalized black, Chicanx, Indigenous, and Asian American students to one that, under the presumed leadership, research, and wisdom of white scholars such as Mina

Shaughnessy and Mike Rose, was finally able to serve underrepresented students of color and multilingual students by recognizing the logic in their grammatical "errors" and the value of their languages. According to the script, these changes in compositionists' pedagogical approaches as the field took a social turn after the 1970s eventually paved the way for the field's current focus on race, diversity, gender, and social justice (Kynard, 2013, p. 171-172). This narrative might show that the field's curricular and pedagogical trajectory began to gravitate towards social issues after the social movements (Hoang, 2015), but completely overlooks both students of color's original demands and the fact that these changes would not have been possible without them. Instead, as Kynard (2013) demonstrates, the integrationist narrative cements Shaughnessy's problematic vision for change in writing instruction via remediation and error analysis as a central part of the field's official history and attributes to white scholars the central role that students of color played in forcing the academy to rethink what counted as education. None of these reformist changes in writing studies as a discipline reflected what the students themselves had actually been fighting for, nor did the master narrative of the field recognize that, through their protests and demands, students of color had reconceptualized literacy as situated practices in historical and political contexts. When forced by students of color to confront the racist and exclusionary dimensions of their practices, writing programs responded by creating reformist curricula and pedagogies that failed to put students of color's interests, contributions, and ways of conceptualizing writing and literacy at the center of their visions for change. As such, writing programs continued to invest in assimilationist projects and failed to create meaningful ideological and structural changes in the field itself and in what its presumed leaders imagined the field's responsibilities to be.

Restricted by administrative directives and pedagogical approaches that were largely still invested in seeing and treating students of color as unprepared for university study, university writing programs were unable to move past basic notions of education and writing that were

epistemologically and ontologically tethered to highly individualized notions of success within the academy and class mobility. Even when compositionists of color attempted to expose the shortcomings of these logics and to push the field forward, university writing programs and the larger field of composition studies still aligned themselves with standard disciplinary frameworks and ideologies. The Black Caucus in the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), Geneva Smitherman, Ernece Kelly (1968), and the contributing writers and editors of the December 1968 special issue of *CCC* (including Kelly, Sarah Webster Fabio [1968], James Banks [1968], Leonard Greenbaum [1968], and Elisabeth McPherson [1968]) made notable efforts to build the political consciousnesses of the field and to force NCTE to take political stances on issues that affected communities of color globally. While they were able to expose the conservative interests of writing scholars and instructors, their attempts to create a new "knowledge production system that would continue to challenge the structure and epistemologies of the educational system that had previously excluded them" (Kynard, 2013, p. 76) were not taken up by the field more broadly. Smitherman's extensive work on Black Language (Smitherman, 1972), for instance, sought to critique bi-dialectalism in writing courses, which was the tendency in writing programs to acknowledge differences in student languages, but with the expectation that students would still need to conform to and master conventional literacy standards. As Kynard (2013) illustrates, Smitherman drew heavily on the work and political mission of the Black Arts Movement in order to redefine student literacies, classroom practices, and pedagogy in ways that would, like the Black Arts Movement, reconceptualize writing genres and create new possibilities for how student writing could raise political consciousness and social awareness (Kynard, 2013, p. 130). Smitherman's attempts to redefine black student literacy and connect it with the Black Arts Movement both exposed and challenged the tendency among writing instructors and researchers to appropriate student literacies as convenient tools that would be used only to ensure the reproduction of mainstream

104

genres, logics, and analytical processes. To Smitherman, Black Language was "more than just being a *systematically* rule-governed grammar" — it was instead "a protracted political praxis for espousing a *systemic* challenge to the hegemonic order and enacted, especially in poetry, a set of assertions of 'the truth' of liberation and revolution to the people" (Kynard, 2013, p. 124). It was "meaning and semantic revolution" (p. 119), and as such, Smitherman argued that reducing it to grammatical standards and conventional writing genres would problematically reproduce middle class values with little attention to the socioeconomic and political experiences and conditions of black communities beyond the classroom (Kynard, 2013, p.139; Smitherman, 1972; Smitherman, 1974). In these ways, her work sought to bring the Black Arts Movement's literature, its rethinking of genre, and its political commitment to social transformation into her classroom. Kynard's (2013) extensive analysis of the deep connections between the Black Arts Movement and Smitherman's work demonstrates that black student writing could be — and already was — equally socially and politically transformative.

While Smitherman's work, along with Kelly's speech and the special December 1968 issue of *CCC* importantly set the foundation for CCCC's 1974 *Students' Right to Their Own Language* (SRTOL) resolution (Conference on College Composition and Communication Committee on Language Policy, 1974; Smitherman, 1999), the resolution itself did not have the wide impacts in writing studies and among writing instructors that its authors and supporters hoped it would. NCTE did not endorse the resolution despite repeated efforts by CCCC to encourage them to do so during the three-year period when the resolution was being drafted and revised. Instead, NCTE ignored SRTOL's explicit commitment to supporting fully students' right to their own dialects and languages, and instead passed NCTE Resolution #74.2, which affirmed the linguistic validity of different dialects but still insisted students should master standard English conventions (NCTE, 1974; Smitherman, 1999, p. 77). NCTE's failure to adopt CCCC's SRTOL resolution made it much more difficult to build the kind of support among

K-12 instructors that Smitherman (1999) believed was needed to shift the writing field's practices on a larger scale. The lack of effort to promote these policies outside of the academy also meant that the resolution itself was essentially unknown and thus disconnected from the lived experiences and realities of the very people and communities it was intended to benefit (Smitherman, 1999).

Kynard (2013) locates the failure to realize fully the possibilities of SRTOL (p. 140) in writing programs as symptomatic of a deeper, more persistent problem in writing studies and writing programs: a refusal among compositionists and the field to embrace students of color's calls for systemic change and to reconceptualize literacy in the ways that they and the Black Arts Movement pushed for. The composition field's negative responses to the visions and literacy work of the student movements and Black Arts Movement were also coupled with the tendency to dehistoricize the movements themselves and the texts that the movements produced. According to Kynard (2013), for instance, writing programs' refusal to situate SRTOL and Smitherman's research in the historical context of the Black Arts Movement and Black Power has led to superficial misreadings of the real intentions and potential of SRTOL and Smitherman's work. Moreover, this has meant that, despite the field's and university writing programs' claims to embrace students' languages and literacies, writing studies has depoliticized students' and faculty of color's attempts to connect literacy to larger social movements and to redefine literacy as revolutionary praxis working towards liberation. Instead, the field has rewritten the history of SRTOL, Smitherman's work, and the history of the fight for open admissions and ethnic studies so they fit within writing studies' integrationist narrative and maintain the integrity of traditional writing standards. Indeed, Hoang (2015) argues that the very students who developed new ethnic studies programming and who had pressured universities to change their approach to education during the social movements of the late 1960s were in fact still cast by their writing instructors as academically underprepared — a positioning that

106

Shaughnessy's work only served to reinforce. Students of color's contributions to composition were completely overlooked, or in some cases, deliberately suppressed or written out of the official narratives that now structure the field. Even the incorrect tendency within writing studies today to attribute SRTOL as a resolution set forth by NCTE instead of CCCC (Kynard, 2013) — the very organization that rejected SRTOL's politics and passed a reformist resolution — is a powerful example that reflects the extent to which the field was able to ignore the work of Smitherman and the Black Caucus. In doing so, it could rewrite its history in order to maintain the misguided notion that the mastery of "standard" English would in fact empower racially and linguistically subordinated students and allow for individual class mobility. The field of writing studies was never able to reconcile its ongoing investment in assimilation and grammar with students of color's demands for an education that would reflect their roots and that would help them respond to local and international racial and economic injustices with material interventions. It failed to see the community- and solidarity-based politics of self-determination, movement building, social transformation, and liberation as a critical foundations for education, writing, and literacy. In this sense, the minor changes that the field made to composition pedagogy in response to the movements for ethnic studies, open admissions, and the SRTOL resolution reflected composition instructors' growing awareness of the changing linguistic, cultural, and economic backgrounds of their students, but demonstrated that the field did not fundamentally prioritize changing its core goals, definitions of literacy, or underlying investment in reproducing disciplinary conventions.

Dismantling "A Tool of This Racist Institution": The Fight to Establish Writing Classes in Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley

If the protests and social movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s did not result in significant changes at the disciplinary or administrative levels in writing programs or in the field

of writing studies more broadly, where were the spaces where students and instructors of color were successful in reconceptualizing student literacy, language, and writing? The composition field's inadequate response to students of color's demands for ideological and conceptual change points to the importance of looking, as Haivan Hoang (2015) does, at how students of color turned away from the academy and began to develop their own politicized spaces outside of the academy where they could build their own politicized forms of writing, literacy, and self-determination in education. Hoang points to the ways that Asian American students in particular found themselves having to work outside of classroom contexts in order to build alternative spaces where they could continue organizing, speaking, and writing against racial injustices because university writing programs' attempts to be more inclusive failed to speak to their political and educational interests. Although writing programs saw Shaughnessy's methods for finding the logic in multilingual students' grammar errors as significant changes that were attuned to the linguistic, cultural, and economic backgrounds of students of color, Asian American students instead wanted an education that would "offer them the opportunity to read about Asian Americans' part in American history, bring their studies to bear on racial and socioeconomic injustices, and participate in rearticulations of American culture" (Hoang, 2015, p. 63). Asian American students thus began to develop their own organizations and self-sponsored publications such as *Gidra*, an Asian American newspaper started by students at UCLA in 1969. These were the spaces where they could write about key issues affecting the Asian American community and where they could connect their struggles to international and third world liberation movements. Over time, they used their self-sponsored publications to begin constructing "an Asian American ethos … defined not only by racial otherness but also by social responsibility and third world nationalisms" (Hoang, 2015, p. 69). These were all topics and ways of working that were not possible to discuss or carry out within the constraints of the traditional composition classes housed in university writing programs. Their turn to literary and

108

cultural production outside of the academy and university writing classes not only offered Asian American students the space to have control over their voices, education, and representation of Asian American consciousness and politics (Ishizuka, 2016), but importantly gave them the space to define their work in ways that were not restricted to campus-based interests. As Murase (1974) points out, although *Gidra* began as a publication that responded to and was situated in the university, in student activism, and in Asian American Studies, its focus shifted quickly to pan-Asian solidarity, third world liberation, the community, antiwar struggles, self-determination, and how their work fit in relation to the larger movement.

While it is important to understand the ways that Asian American students were using writing outside of the university to develop political thought and analysis, it is also critical to note that the difficult work of trying to create ideological and epistemological change *within* university writing programs was an ongoing process. Hoang's (2015) research documents the critical roles that self-sponsored publications and community-based movements played in building new forms of writing and student-run spaces where writing for political and community purposes could flourish and contribute to larger attempts to build a social movement. Yet, even as students created their own writing spaces that were free of instructional and administrative oversight, students of color and faculty of color simultaneously continued the important work of attempting to transform writing instruction within the university so that writing classes could better align with the politics that students of color were advocating for. As the work and research of Smitherman and other compositionists show, many students and faculty of color were still actively trying to create localized changes within university writing courses and programs by bringing movements like the Black Arts Movement and Black Power into their classes even as their colleagues and students sought to build spaces outside of the university where writing could advance their political analysis and commitments to social transformation. These two approaches were not mutually exclusive: as the field of writing

studies depoliticized and attempted to restrict the reach and potential of these new forms of literacy, students and faculty of color saw the need to create spaces both in and outside of the academy where they could turn writing into a tool for social and political change. As a result, new spaces and programs within the university notably began to take up the difficult work of transforming writing courses so they could speak to students' cultural roots, their deep political commitments, and their interest in using their education to effect racial and socioeconomic change in their communities. These new sites for reconceptualizing the work of academic writing were not housed within traditional writing programs or in grassroots student organizations, but instead formed specifically in response to the ongoing racial problems that student protesters and faculty of color saw in traditional writing programs' courses, pedagogies, and perceptions of what counted as legitimate writing. Emergent Ethnic Studies programs, including African American Studies, Asian American Studies, Chicano Studies, and Native American Studies, were key places on university campuses where students and faculty of color began to develop their own writing courses in the late 1960s and early 1970s that were separate from traditional university writing courses. The UC Berkeley Afro-American Student Union as well as the newly formed Afro-American Studies program and Asian Studies division at UC Berkeley were particularly critical in leading the charge to reconceptualize what counted as writing instruction. They reenvisioned what was possible when black students, Asian American students, and other students of color had opportunities to redefine what counted as relevant knowledge in university writing courses and lay the groundwork for making these visions a reality.

Before examining writing instruction in UC Berkeley's Ethnic Studies programs, it is important to note that much of the Berkeley Ethnic Studies department's work around writing instruction and the advances it made in reconceptualizing writing instruction have either been ignored in mainstream writing studies scholarship or suppressed in the official history that

structures the field today. Three texts have been written in the past twenty-five years that examine the history of both "remedial" writing instruction at the University of California (Alford, 1995; Bauer, 2003; Stanley, 2010) as well as the University of California Subject A writing exam that was used to assess incoming students' writing levels and to place them into appropriate writing courses. The history of how Berkeley's ethnic studies programs designed their own writing classes in response to the racist forms of writing instruction and assessment at the university is nearly non-existent in these texts. Jane Stanley's (2010) study on the history of remedial writing at UC Berkeley offers the most comprehensive discussion of the racism that Asian American students in Berkeley's writing classes faced during the late 1960s and late 1980s. Her work situates the University of California's (UC) remedial writing program as a tool with which UC administrators could respond to various political, economic, and social pressures while positioning the university in politically advantageous ways. Her work acknowledges that Asian American students were disproportionately affected by the university writing program's form- and grammar-based assessment practices, which led to high failure rates among Asian American and Asian immigrant students who were "held" repeatedly for the Subject A remedial writing class. Yet, despite acknowledging the underlying racism within the Subject A exam and class, Stanley's work largely focuses on making sense of the political rhetoric and institutional goals that structured university administrators' responses to the racial and linguistic discrimination in these courses. Rather than examining the situation from the perspective of the ethnic studies programs, faculty, and students themselves, Stanley's research prioritizes exposing how administrators responded to complaints of racism within Subject A by using what she calls the "rhetoric of remediation." This is the process by which UC administrators would constantly criticize and denigrate the supposedly sub-par writing skills of its "underprepared" student writers while simultaneously celebrating the university's willingness to help any student meet university writing standards by offering basic skills writing classes. By constantly engaging in

111

what Stanley and Glynda Hull describe as the "peculiar institutional ambivalence toward underprepared students" (Stanley, 2010, p. 5), the university strategically used its writing classes as a way to establish itself as an institution that could at once fulfill its obligation to educate all students (even those in need of so-called remedial education) while also demonstrating that its academic standards (high enough to require over 30-50% of admitted students to enroll in entry-level writing classes regularly [Stanley, 2010, p. 129]) were on par with those set at elite private universities. In these ways, Stanley demonstrates that remedial courses and academic writing programs have in fact been more valuable for advancing the UC system's political and institutional ambitions as an elite public university than they have been in actually supporting the needs and futures of the students themselves.

Stanley's research has importantly pushed administrators and instructors in university writing programs to confront and reexamine critically their own participation in the rhetoric of remediation and in the practice of "embracing and disgracing" (Stanley, 2010) the students who take their classes. However, because her work examines the history of racism and remediation from the perspectives of university administrators and the university writing program, it does not actually show readers how Berkeley's Afro-American Student Union, Afro-American Studies program, Asian Studies division, and the larger Ethnic Studies department actually reconceptualized writing classes in the late 1960s. It overlooks the rich history of what was possible once the ethnic studies programs were able to design and control their own writing courses and how these programs and their students reenvisioned the work and politics of academic writing. It is thus critical to understand the work that UC Berkeley's Ethnic Studies programs did to transform and establish different forms of writing instruction for students of color. Researchers tend to study only traditional university composition programs to see where, how, and to what extent these programs changed their approaches for working with underrepresented and multilingual students of colors. This runs the risk of reinscribing the very

112

forms of strategic historical rewriting that both Kynard (2013) and Hoang (2015) argue erase the important contributions of student and faculty activists from the "official" history of writing instruction. As Kynard (2013, p. 189) reminds us, attempts to find black scholars in the existing histories and research of open admissions and traditional writing programs will merely reproduce writing studies's canonized narrative; the long, rich history of work that black scholars, instructors, and community members had been engaged in long before writing studies shifted its focus to social issues can only be found outside of conventional writing programs and writing studies publications. To this end, it is important to recognize that the people who most changed writing in the university and who created the most innovative classroom spaces for students of color to write were not necessarily compositionists or scholars in traditional university writing programs or in the field of composition studies itself. They were people in other programs who created small but notable spaces where students and faculty of color could transform how their students, and eventually other departments in the university, came to see and experience the real work and possibilities of academic reading and composition. For these reasons, writing about academic writing instruction from their perspectives reveals a rich history of their contributions and ways of reimagining academic writing to serve students and communities of color.

The role that UC Berkeley's ethnic studies programs played in transforming academic writing in the late 1960s and early 1970s must be understood in the context of the student-led activism at San Francisco State College (SFSC). Throughout the 1960s, SFSC students of color organized to address local racial and economic inequities both in their communities and at the college itself. Students at SFSC sought to connect their education with community-based struggles and movements, and thus began developing their own programs with funding from the Associated Student government (Ferreira, 2003). Student-initiated programs included the Tutorial Program (a tutoring program in San Francisco for black children modeled after SNCC's

freedom schools, which was eventually restructured and led by George Murray in 1966 to better support black students and promote black consciousness), the Community Involvement Program (where college students organized in communities of color for college credit throughout San Francisco and with larger community-based movements such as the National Farm Workers Association strike and the Black Arts Movement), and the Experimental College (Ferreira, 2003; Maeda, 2012). The Experimental College, which students developed in spring of 1966, was designed to offer an alternative to the mainstream curriculum at SFSC. Instructors who taught these courses, including students and community activists, offered non-traditional course topics that spoke to student interests and experiences and also politicized the students who enrolled. In March 1967, the Black Student Union at SFSC, which had been offering courses about Black culture and art through their Black Arts and Culture Series within the Experimental College (SFSC Black Students Union, 1968), proposed the creation of an Institute of Black Studies and a special admissions program for black students at SFSC so that black students could have access to a curriculum that addressed issues specific to their interests and experiences (Maeda, 2012). Eleven Black Studies courses were offered in Fall 1967, and Nathan Hare, who became the program chair in spring of 1968, issued a comprehensive proposal for Black Studies called "A Conceptual Proposal for Black Studies" in April of 1968. Hare's proposal for Black Studies argued that traditional curricula, academic standards, and teaching pedagogies needed to be completely reconceptualized in order to address systemic racial inequities in traditional scholarship and academic disciplines. Doing so would not only transform education within the university, but would also connect black studies to the wider community. When the Third World Liberation Front formed later that year, its proposal for the School of Third World Studies followed Hare's proposal and similarly called for community-based programs and curricula that would be taught by people of color with experiential knowledge. The proposed School of Third World Studies would encompass a Division of Black Studies,

Asian American Studies (including departments of Filipino, Japanese, and Chinese American Studies), and Native American Studies (including Native American and La Raza Studies), and the Third World Liberation Front envisioned that this would be a site where students of color could receive an education that would emerge from and help them respond to the needs of their communities.

The Third World Liberation Front's demand for a School of Ethnic Studies controlled by students of color did not specifically call for the reconceptualization of writing instruction, but composition courses were included in the proposed curricula both for Black Studies and for the proposed Chinese Ethnic Studies Department. Even before the Third World Liberation Front formed, the spring 1968 Black Student Union's Black Studies curriculum included two sections of a freshman composition course, in addition to its fifteen other course offerings in anthropology, education, literature, history, humanities, psychology, and sociology that were specific to the histories, lived experiences, and realities of black communities (SFSC Black Student Union, 1968). The two sections of freshman composition in Black Studies were taught by George Murray (SFSC Black Student Union, 1968) who was working as a part-time instructor in the English department. There is little information available about how Murray conceptualized and taught these composition courses. Most accounts of Murray's professional responsibilities at SFSC focus either on his work as program coordinator of the Tutorial Program, his work as Minister of Education in the Black Panther Party, and SFSC's attempts to suspend Murray over statements he had made in Cuba expressing solidarity with Vietnamese guerrillas and connecting their struggles to the struggles the black community faced in the U.S. (Ferreira, 2003; Maeda, 2012). While course descriptions of the Black Studies classes offered in spring of 1968 explain how the material in each course was designed to address issues relevant to black students, the description for Murray's sections of English 6.1 and 6.2 simply reads, "Composition (3-3): Development of reading and writing skills. Satisfies general education

english requirement" (SFSC Black Student Union, 1968, p. 4). In Fall 1968, Murray was rehired by the SFSC English department to teach freshman composition for students who had been admitted to the college through the Educational Opportunity admissions program — a decision that was met with significant pushback from the CSU trustees (Maeda, 2012). In discussing his work as a freshman composition instructor, Murray stated that he taught "primarily black students who have been denied the privilege of correct education in the schools as they exist today …" (CBS5 KPIX-TV, 1968). Despite the lack of information about the content of Murray's freshman composition course and how he and the students conceptualized writing, the fact that writing classes as well as writing instruction for EOP students were included in the Black Studies curriculum is telling. The Black Student Union and the English department recognized that writing instruction needed to be relevant to the needs and experiences of students of color, and that this in part meant that writing instruction needed to be housed in non-English and non-writing departments. This understanding was also later taken up by Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action (ICSA), a student group at SFSC that formed in 1967 and that was comprised of Chinese students who developed independent, community-based projects in Chinatown meant to support working-class Chinese and Chinatown youth (Umemoto, 1989). ICSA's tutorial program for immigrant youth advocated for bilingual classes at Galileo High and offered English language skills so that youth in Chinatown could actively participate in and transform their schools (Umemoto, 1989). Their work in Chinatown to transform educational institutions to meet the needs of working-class and immigrant youth laid the foundation for ICSA's immediate support for and active involvement in the Third World Liberation Front (Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action, 1968a) and also shaped their proposal for a Chinese Ethnic Studies Department that could address the linguistic, cultural, and economic problems that the Chinese community in Chinatown faced (Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action, 1968b). ICSA's proposed course offerings for a Chinese Ethnic Studies

department included a class in Cantonese (meant to focus attention on the actual language spoken by Chinese immigrants and the majority of residents in Chinatown, rather than SFSC's interest in teaching Mandarin), a course examining the specific educational and socioeconomic challenges Chinatown residence experienced, and an English as a Second Language course for Chinese students that was meant to focus on the unique challenges that Chinese immigrants faced in building literacy. Similar to TWLF's and the Black Student Union's call for an education that was relevant to students and communities of color, ICSA's proposal for its ESL course showed that it wanted to give "special emphasis on the difficulties of the Chinese immigrant's problems in reading, writing, and speaking English" (Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action, 1986b). ICSA recognized that the pedagogies in mainstream writing and English courses were inadequate for addressing the unique needs, experiences, and interests of Chinese students when it came to building their literacy skills.

Students at UC Berkeley also recognized that reading and composition courses needed to be included in the movement to reconceptualize education. Inspired by SFSC and the SFSC Third World Liberation Front, Berkeley students and their respective organizations, including the Afro-American Student Union (AASU), the Mexican American Students Confederation (MASC), the Asian American Political Alliance (AAPA), and the Native American Student Union (NASU), were similarly engaged in ongoing struggles in 1968 to establish ethnic studies programs on the campus (Dong, 2002; Maeda, 2012). That year, the Mexican American Students Confederation (MASC) engaged in ongoing efforts for five months to pressure the university to boycott table grapes in order to support the United Farm Workers (UFW) who were on strike. Despite winning verbal agreements from the UC president in October 1968 to remove table grapes as well as promises to establish a Center for Mexican American Studies and a position for a Chicano assistant to the president, MASC was unable to establish a Chicano Studies program and to build full control over the Center with actual decision-making and financial power (Dong,

2002, p. 55). The AASU experienced similar challenges in trying to enact changes in the university. Students in AASU submitted their proposal for African American Studies to the administration in April 1968, but were subjected to repeated requests for revision and ongoing referrals to different administrative departments for review over a nine month period. By the time the proposal was approved by the College of Letters and Sciences in January 1969, it no longer reflected the AASU's underlying interests, and was rejected by the AASU as "an affront to the principal of self-determination that represented a continuation of the white elites policy dictating the needs of racial minorities" (Dong, 2002, p. 54). AAPA also negotiated with the university for curricula that would be relevant to Asian American students and won its first class, Asian Studies 100X, which was taught in the winter term of 1969 with 400 students (Dong, 2002, p. 56). Yet, like MASC and AASU, AAPA also experienced ongoing challenges in dealing with university bureaucracy as its members tried to fight for the curricula and resources that would be relevant to their needs and experiences. The challenges each of these organizations faced as they tried to negotiate with the university and to establish full control over their education led them to form the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) at UC Berkeley later that year.

During the several months preceding the actual formation of Berkeley's TWLF and the start of the strike at Berkeley in January 1969, the AASU launched several important initiatives for reading and composition curricular development. The AASU was the first of the student organizations at Berkeley to link reading and composition and academic writing to its larger push for curricular change, and, like its proposal for a relevant curriculum, its reading and composition initiatives sought to serve students of color and to connect their experiences and needs to larger social issues. At the beginning of the winter semester in 1968, graduate students from the UC Berkeley English department, as well as Jim Nabors, a black student activist, began to audit Sarah Webster Fabio's African American literature class at Merritt Junior College in

order to assess the viability of establishing a similar class at UC Berkeley where black students were trying to initiate curricular changes in writing instruction (Webster Fabio, 1968a). Webster Fabio had helped to develop courses on African American literature, culture, and language for Merritt College's English department and the campus's newly developed Black Studies program (Webster Fabio, 1968a). As a writer, poet, activist, and scholar who was heavily involved in the community, she saw writing, literature, and the performing arts as important mediums through which social change, activism, and political analysis could begin to take shape. As such, she worked on many fronts to establish curricula and creative spaces (New, 2018) that would speak to "the need, desire, and will of the people" (Webster Fabio, 1968b, p. i-ii). Webster Fabio's work as an instructor, faculty advisor, and mentor was critical in opening opportunities for students at Merritt College to develop a new Black consciousness situated within larger historical, cultural, and political contexts (New, 2018), and in her work with the Black Panthers, she was "one of the few teachers who could relate to and motivate them" (Cheryl Fabio, as quoted in New, 2018, p. 60).

Jim Nabors's interest in Webster Fabio's course and her pedagogical approach soon led him to issue a proposal for an Afro-American Literature class to be taught by Webster Fabio at UC Berkeley, which was formally announced in *The Daily Californian* on January 15, 1968 (Webster Fabio, 1968a, p. 10). This proposal immediately sparked intense push-back from the professors in the UC Berkeley English department such as David Littlejohn, who argued that black literature was unworthy of study (Webster Fabio, 1968a). In May 1968, members of the AASU submitted their proposal for Black Studies to Chancellor Roger W. Heyns, and Black freshmen in the AASU met with C.D. Chrétien, Director of Subject A and English for Foreign Students. They demanded that the Subject A department, which offered non-credit, "remedial" writing courses for Berkeley freshmen who did not pass an entrance writing exam, begin to offer writing courses that taught black literature (Chrétien, 1969). The AASU students argued that

119

literature and reading material in their high schools, which catered to students who grew up in white, middle-class households, had not only inadequately prepared them to pass the Subject A exam, but also made it impossible to be exposed to the kind of literature about the Black Experience that would help them both to gain self-knowledge and to be positioned to help their communities. They maintained that these same forms of racial discrimination were operating in the Subject A department, where the reading material reflected similar values and assumptions about students' racial and socioeconomic backgrounds (Chrétien, 1969). In an official statement denouncing the Subject A program, black freshmen in the AASU argued that "the majority of Black Freshmen are victims of racist exploitation by … Subject A" and described the department as "a tool of this racist institution" (UC Berkeley AASU Black Freshmen, 1968, p. 2). Under pressure from the black students and under the advisement of the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences and Assistant Chancellor of Academic Affairs Andrew Billingsley, who had been appointed by the chancellor to help establish a Black Studies Department by Fall 1969 (Taylor, 2010), Chrétien finally hired Webster Fabio as a lecturer in Berkeley's Subject A program for the 1968-1969 academic year with special funding from the dean. Webster Fabio would teach two sections of Subject A each quarter with a focus on black literature (Chrétien, 1969).

Webster Fabio began teaching Subject A writing with a focus on black perspective and black literature in the fall semester of 1968 (Billingsley, 1968). Her course was one of five Black Studies classes offered in the College of Letters and Sciences that term as a result of the AASU efforts in April 1968 to propose a Black Studies department (Taylor, 2010). Fifty-four students signed up to take Webster Fabio's Subject A course that term, forty-four of whom were black students, and one of whom was a black graduate student who asked to audit her course (Webster Fabio, 1968a, p. 8). Like the students who fought to hire her and who fought for writing courses that would be taught from a black perspective with black literature, Webster Fabio understood

the importance of these sections and their implications. She described Subject A as a course "where the bulk of Third World people, especially Black students are placed as a result of discriminatory, criminally inaccurate white-oriented achievement and placement tests," and wrote of her work that, "as a Black teacher, I am teaching this course primarily for Blacks … it is taught from a black perspective; it recognizes the Black mother tongue as a possible, effective, poetic language which is a very natural outgrowth of the Black experience; and, I use Black literature as models of form for expository writing" (Webster Fabio, 1968a, p. 7). Shortly after the start of the fall term on October 7, 1968, black freshmen from the AASU issued a formal statement to Chancellor Heyns and met with both Heyns and Robert L. Johnson to reiterate their concerns with the racist structure of the Subject A department. In their statement, they also explained the significance of Webster Fabio's class for their education and their development: "Black students must receive an education which will prepare them to relate and communicate to the total Black Community. Section 35 of the Subject A provides an essential part of such an education. An instructor with the ability of Mrs. Sarah Fabio, to relate to black students makes this class a great deal more significant and vital to the development of black students than the regularly structured Subject A Class" (UC Berkeley AASU Black Freshmen, 1968, p. 2). The students' recognition of the "exceptional nature of Section 35 of the Subject A" (p. 2) led them to submit six demands to Chancellor Heyns, which sought to remedy the economic, evaluative, and educational racism that structured Subject A at UC Berkeley and which proposed new ways of conceptualizing writing instruction for black students:

- that the university waive the $45 Subject A course fee for black students, given that they were forced to enroll in the course because of institutional racism in the education system;

- that the university grant black students full credit for Webster Fabio's section of Subject A, given its relevance to their lives and educations compared to regular Subject A courses;

- that the Subject A department offer Webster Fabio's section as a tutorial class for students who needed to fulfill the Subject A requirement, to be taken simultaneously with a black literature course;

- that black students who had already fulfilled their Subject A requirement be allowed to take Webster Fabio's course for full credit due to the strength of her teaching and the importance of the course material for their development;

- that the Subject A department remove all racist topics from the Subject A exam, which prevented black students from writing from a black perspective;

- that evaluators of the Subject A exam be tested for their ability to work effectively with black students and to understand their perspectives (UC Berkeley AASU Black Freshmen, 1968)

The administration's response to the AASU black freshmen's demands was revealing. The administration maintained that, as a remedial course, Subject A was a "service offered for the convenience of a particular segment of the students," and as such, had no bearing on the university's larger responsibilities for maintaining its regularly-funded degree programs and curricula (EWM, 1968). The financial implications of this were clear: because it was a remedial course, Subject A was not meant to be included as a regular part of the degree-granting programs, and thus the perception was that it should not be supported with the funds designated for "regular" (e.g., non-remedial, credit-bearing) courses. The administration argued that students were getting a discount in only paying $45 for "a service which costs about $70 per student (per term course)" (EWM, 1968, p. 1) and further maintained that keeping the fees

served as incentive for high school students to improve their writing in order to meet the standards that would exempt them from having to enroll in and pay for Subject A courses (EWM, 1968). To put the $45 Subject A fee in context, the registration fee for all UC Berkeley students in 1968 was $300 per year (Vega, 2014). There was no tuition at the time for California residents, and non-California residents paid $1,200 annually in tuition (Vega, 2014). Berkeley administrators recommended that the chancellor consider offering grants to pay for the Subject A fees for minority students to avoid the complications of using fee waivers and financial aid to pay for the fees. Their response and analysis not only ignored the very forms of systemic racism in the K-12 education system that the AASU's statement and demands had pointed to, but in doing so, reinforced the AASU's assertion that Subject A was also guilty of reproducing these racist practices and forms of discrimination against black students.

Despite the administration's unwillingness to meet the AASU demands in full, the AASU's and the AASU black freshmen's critical analysis of the structural problems with both Subject A and writing instruction in the public school system more broadly were significant accomplishments. Their analysis as well as their success in hiring Webster Fabio to teach black literature in Subject A sections created the space where they could begin reconceptualizing writing instruction at UC Berkeley. Webster Fabio continued to teach two sections of Subject A with a focus on black literature and black perspectives each term for the remainder of the 1968-1969 academic year. Although she eventually transferred to the Black Studies program to teach literature and poetry courses once the Black Studies program was established in 1969, Chrétien had recommended that she be reappointed in Subject A for the 1969-1970 academic year because of her great success working with black students (Chrétien, 1969). By the 1970-1971 academic year, Black Studies had expanded its offerings of reading and composition and had three faculty members teaching writing courses. In addition to offering Afro-American Studies Subject A, which offered a basic introduction to the principles of composition relevant

to black students and their experiences (UC Berkeley Afro-American Studies, 1970b), the program now offered a 5-unit course introductory course to expository writing relevant to black students (Afro-American Studies Literature 1A) and a 5-unit introductory course to writing and literature relevant to the experiences of black students (Afro-American Studies Literature 1B). Both of the courses fulfilled university writing requirements, were housed in the Afro-American Studies program, and focused on black literature (Thomas, 1970-1971). The 1200 incoming freshmen who needed to fulfill their Subject A requirement in fall of 1970 and the increasing number of students who were completing the African American Studies 1A and 1B courses successfully led the program to request additional sections of African American Studies Subject A, Afro-American Studies 1A, and Afro-American Studies 1B that fall (UC Berkeley Black Faculty, 1970). In the fall quarter alone, Afro-American Studies expected to offer one section of Subject A (housed in Subject A), one section of 1A, and two sections of 1B (UC Berkeley Afro-American Studies, 1970a).

By this point, Afro-American Studies instructors saw their work in academic writing as going beyond the mere inclusion and study of black literature in composition courses: they recognized that the acquisition of academic writing skills was closely connected to the development of research skills that would be critical to meet the needs of the black community. Having control over their own writing courses presented an opportunity for the program to hire instructors who could help their students build the research and writing basis needed to meet those needs (Lewis, 1970). In his September 21, 1970 note to Chancellor Heyns and Vice Chancellor Robert Connick, Afro-American Studies Coordinator Ron Lewis (1970) requested that the university increase the program's 7.41 FTE for 24 faculty members in the previous 1969-1970 academic year to 19.94 FTE for 27 faculty members for the upcoming 1970-1971 academic year. Lewis argued that this request to increase the Afro-American Studies program's FTE was meant to make the most of the high-quality faculty they had hired and would set a

crucial foundation for transforming the program into a department. This long-range planning included focusing on "highly skilled technical writers … who are highly skilled in … research" to meet the needs of the black community more effectively, as well as hiring Fred Smith, a PhD student in English at Berkeley, and Roy Thomas, a doctoral candidate in English at Stanford to teach Afro-American Studies writing classes (Lewis, 1970). As part of this initiative, Smith and Thomas would help the program's writing lecturer Robert Coleman to develop the program's Subject A, 1A, and 1B courses towards these research goals (Lewis, 1970). As the Afro-American Studies program evolved, its writing instructors took on important roles in building the program that went beyond reading and composition instruction. Robert Coleman became the director of African Study and Travel trips and Roy Thomas became the advisor of the Black Studies Student Association and helped to organize media programs. Fred Smith eventually wrote and presented to the Afro-American Studies program both a history of black faculty efforts at Berkeley and HNCUs to support black students as well as a proposal for an academic masterplan (Smith, 1972). His proposal came at a critical moment in 1972 when the program's future was uncertain due to the unexpected dismissal of program coordinator Ron Lewis and Chancellor Albert Bowkers's unilateral decision to hire William Banks to replace Lewis (Taylor, 2010, p. 260). The chancellor's decision violated the 1969 TWLF agreement stipulating that faculty, students, and community members should be involved in hiring decisions (Taylor, 2010), which led to black students in AASU to boycott Banks's classes and the Afro-American Studies program through the winter quarter of 1973 (Taylor, 2010, p. 260-261).

The AASU's successes both in exposing the racism of Subject A writing instruction on campus and in subsequently establishing control over its own writing courses set in motion important opportunities for the Asian Studies Division, La Raza Studies, and Native American Studies to do the same. One year after Subject A hired Webster Fabio, La Raza Studies hired John Waterhouse to teach La Raza Studies 5A and 5B: Rhetoric and Communication Skills (later

retitled Chicano Studies 1A-1B) and La Raza Studies 6: The Research Paper for La Raza Studies (later retitled Chicano Studies 108) for the 1969-1970 academic year. The Asian Studies division hired Elaine Kim (referred to as Elaine Kim Newman in archival documents) to teach Asian Studies 3 (Subject A) and also began to offer Asian Studies 1A: Asian Studies Reading and Composition (Billingsley, 1969; UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Faculty, n.d.; Billingsley, Davidson, & Loya, 1970; UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Fall and Winter Quarter Enrollments, 1969; UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Program Survey, n.d.). During the 1970-1971 academic year, both La Raza Studies and the Asian Studies division expanded their course offerings to include multiple sections of 1B writing courses to accommodate the demand for students who had successfully completed the 1A composition classes in their respective programs (La Raza Studies, 1970; Office of the Academic Senate, 1970). In keeping with the program's commitment to developing courses relevant to the needs of its students, La Raza Studies was able to develop two sets of writing courses that reflected the multilingual backgrounds of Chicanx students: La Raza 1, 2, and 3 focused on teaching rhetoric, communication, and language skills in Spanish, while La Raza 5A-5B focused on rhetoric, language, and communication skills in English (La Raza Studies, n.d.). Students in La Raza 5A-5B engaged in long-term projects that were grounded in issues they found relevant to their lives and cultures, and that pushed them to work and speak directly with individuals and community members in order to gather and analyze information from multiple perspectives. Richard Chabram and Chris Jordan, for instance, two students enrolled in La Raza 5A-5B, requested and were granted an interview with Vice Chancellor John H. Raleigh in Fall of 1969 as part of their ongoing, research-based language project on the Vietnam Moratorium (Chabram & Jordan, 1969). These kinds of investigative projects in La Raza Studies writing courses where students were expected to seek out different perspectives in order analyze issues reflected a different way of engaging students in reading and writing: unlike the literature-based courses offered in Afro-American Studies and Asian Studies that focused on

126

published texts, La Raza Studies was invested in opening spaces for students to begin building their own research projects and data in entry-level writing courses (Waterhouse, 1972). The program would then assist students in honing these the foundational skills in La Raza 6 where they would have opportunities to engage in more sustained work on research papers. John Waterhouse, a long-time writing lecturer in the Chicano Studies program, explained the importance of this approach in his course description for Chicano Studies 1A-1B (formerly La Raza 5A-5B) in 1972, stating that, "Chicano Studies 1A-1B … seeks to develop English expression by having students draw initially on their own immediate experience for the themes and issues they want to communicate in both speech and writing … There is … no a priori reading list and a class generated 'text' composed of students' own writing and the readings chosen during the quarter, replaces the more usual textbook of model essays … The curriculum maintains here as a primary principle the concept that effective writing stems from students' needs to communicate their own ideas and feelings and that these needs are often muzzled by instructor-set topics and readings irrelevant to the students' own experiences" (Waterhouse, 1972). In these ways, the curriculum of the writing courses in La Raza Studies and Chicano Studies was meant to be generated by the students themselves and their interests, and challenged the notion that the instructor should drive the curriculum.

Relative to La Raza Studies, the Asian Studies division, and Afro-American Studies, Native American Studies experienced more difficulties in developing its own independent composition courses. During the 1969-1970 and 1970-1971 academic years, writing courses for Native American Studies were built into existing Comparative Literature 1A-1B courses called English Composition in Connection with the Reading of World Literature, with one section specifically devoted to Native American Studies majors that would extend the work already being done in the two-term Elementary Navajo sequence for freshmen, Comp Lit 6A-6B (Knight, 1969; Resources in Native American Indian Studies at Berkeley, Appendix B2, 1970). This

writing and language sequence was modeled after a similar pilot course that had previously been offered in the Comparative Literature department for bilingual Chicanx students, designed to draw on students' strengths in languages and their interest in their cultural backgrounds (Resources for Native American Indian Studies at Berkeley, Appendix B2, 1970). It was not until the 1971-1972 academic year that Native American Studies 1A-1B Reading and Composition (Doyle, 1971c) was approved and housed within the program itself.

Writing as Self-Determination: The Fight for Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C

Support for these ethnic studies writing courses from the directors of Subject A existed during the first few years the courses were offered, but this did not necessarily mean that the university writing program or Berkeley administrators changed the campus-wide writing standards or ideologies that disenfranchised students of color and multilingual students. Ethnic Studies lecturers quickly exposed the systemic racism and white supremacist ideologies underlying Subject A classes and writing pedagogies on campus, but even as they began to design and teach their own classes in the newly formed ethnic studies programs, they were still forced to follow university regulations concerning Subject A and were subjected to prevailing racist attitudes around writing instruction. The Asian Studies Division at Berkeley offers a clear example of its ongoing struggle to establish complete control over its writing courses. The division served 140 students across six sections of Asian Studies 3 (Subject A) in the Fall 1970 term alone (Class Enrollments, Ethnic Studies Fall Quarter 1970, 1970), and offered six sections of 1A in the winter term (Asian Studies Division of Ethnic Studies, 1970a) and seven sections of 1B that spring (Asian Studies Division of Ethnic Studies, 1970b). Acting director of Subject A, Myrsam H. Wixman, noted Asian Studies 3 (Subject A) for its success in addressing the long-term problems the Subject A program had historically faced with the low passing rates among Asian American students enrolled in regular Subject A courses (Wixman, 1970). In a letter to

Charles Jones, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy-Remedial Education, Wixman noted that Asian Studies 3 seemed to be successfully responding to earlier complaints against the Subject A program about the racist treatment of Asian Americans (Stanley, 2010). University records also indicate that for the 1970-1971 academic year, the Asian Studies division was also able to win a year-long fee waiver of the $45 Subject A fee, full university course credit, and a pass/not pass grading option for all students enrolled in Asian Studies 3 in order to facilitate students' ability to focus on developing their comfort in speaking and writing about issues relevant to them (Fong, 1970; Knight, 1971). These victories for Asian Studies were not insignificant: when the AASU fought for Subject A courses on black literature in 1968, its members demanded that black freshmen receive Subject A fee waivers and full credit for a non-credit course they were required to pay for because they recognized that Subject A writing courses and administrative practices were a continuation of the racist education system that disenfranchised and disproportionately impacted black students. The Asian Studies division's success in winning these demands for their Subject A-equivalent course two years after AASU fought for these rights reflects both the importance of the AASU's demands and the demands' ongoing relevance to other students of color.

These successes, however, sparked pushback from the university administration, including the Committee on Courses, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Academic Senate Committee on Subject A, as well as the Subject A program itself. All grew concerned that the Asian Studies division had succeeded in gaining full-credit status and a fee waiver for Asian Studies 3 when students enrolled in regular sections of Subject A were not granted the same privileges (Doyle, 1970; Dekker, 1971; Johnson, 1971a; Knight, 1971; O'Hehir, 1971). The Subject A program's concerns stemmed from the increasing hostility that both the Subject A director and faculty faced from students enrolled in Subject A classes, who were upset with having to pay the prohibitive $45 fee without receiving any credit for a 5-unit class (Johnson,

1971a). The university Committee on Courses and Committee on Educational Policy, however, saw the problem as one of granting course credit to so-called "remedial" courses — which, at the time, included Asian Studies 3 (Subject A), Black Studies 3 (Subject A), Precalculus S-0, and Engineering 5A-5B-5C — that they perceived as offering curricula that was "essentially the equivalent of high school material" (Dekker, 1971). Brendan P. O'Hehir (1971), Chairman of the Committee on Educational Policy, argued that offering course credit for Asian Studies 3 and Black Studies 3 would violate university policies stipulating that students could not receive credit for courses with the same curriculum as high school courses or for courses required for entrance to the university. Furthermore, he claimed that the discrepancies between the credit/no-credit and fee/no-fee statuses for Asian Studies 3 and Subject A were "discriminatory." O'Hehir (1971) conceded that the "special circumstances that have led to these [Asian Studies's and Black Studies's] proposals" needed to be taken into account and thus offered the possibility of amending university policy so that students in need of fulfilling the Subject A requirement could instead "postpone fulfillment of the Subject A requirement and take for credit in the first quarter of residence an English Proficiency course the content of which would not duplicate secondary school work." However, his proposal and his earlier comments about the remedial nature of Ethnic Studies writing courses seemed to ignore two critical issues: that the literature-based curricula for both Black Studies 3 and Asian Studies 3 had been specifically conceptualized and designed in response to the failure of high schools to offer curricula relevant to the experiences, interests, and aspirations of students of color; and that separating the literary aspects of the course curriculum that were relevant to students of color from the "remedial" writing and skills-based components into two separate courses (the English Proficiency course and the Subject A course) would run the risk of reproducing the very problems that originally drove the AASU students to demand their own writing classes.

130

These responses revealed that, despite their written approval and praise for classes like Asian Studies 3 and Black Studies 3, and regardless of the Ethnic Studies programs' concerted efforts to transform course content so that students of color could use their education to transform their communities, university administrators and committees would always look at these courses through the lens of remediation and normative, skills-based standards. In turn, they would continue to essentialize the difficulties students of color had in meeting those standards as problems characteristic of students of specific racial or ethnic backgrounds. Wixman (1970), for instance, commended Asian Studies 3 not for the social or political motivations driving the course but because it reduced Asian American students' "difficulty with English idiom and idiomatic sentence structure, difficulty in handling complex sentence structure, difficulty with word choices, and difficulty with such matters as subject-verb and antecedent-pronoun agreement, verb tense, and plural number." Wixman (1970) also valued the class for fixing what she perceived as "the tendency of many Asian-American students to write perfunctory, relatively undeveloped essays, and also a reluctance to take a strong position in an argumentative essay." These sentiments were echoed by the supervisor of Subject A Sabina Johnson (1971b) who, despite her insistence that Subject A was not solely focused on "mechanics" (p. 4), argued in her report on Subject A from 1970-71 that all students, but minority students in particular, needed to master Standard English in order to gain "linguistic freedom of choice." Johnson (1971b) believed that this "freedom" would come for students in the form of strengthening their vocabulary, sentence structure, logical thinking, voice, and immersion in standard English language because "the perpetuation of dialect furthers racial separatism in the form of linguistic ghettoizing" (p. 2). Johnson (1971b) acknowledged the importance of having faculty of color teach writing courses that would focus on race and accordingly offered several "minority sections" of Subject A (including a section for Chicano students, one for Chicano and Native-American students, several sections for black students, and

131

one section for Asian American students) that ostensibly shared the same objectives as the

Subject A writing courses housed in the Ethnic Studies programs. Yet, her racialized justification

for offering these sections — that "Native Americans and ghetto Blacks have a hard time

grasping, for example, the concept of the sentence, and some Asians, as everyone knows, have

great trouble with the article and the concept of tense" (Johnson, 1971b, p. 16) — not only

revealed that Johnson herself subscribed to highly racist perceptions of students of color and

their writing abilities, but that these tendencies to associate specific grammatical "deficits" with

specific racial groups were in fact still driving Subject A's programmatic decisions and trajectory

when it came to working with students of color. Although Subject A dutifully offered several

sections of Subject A for students of color and hired faculty of color to teach these sections, the

program failed to change the racist ideologies that structured its policies and practices, nor did it

adopt the considerably more complex visions and political analysis that the Ethnic Studies

programs used to conceptualize their writing courses.

Subject A's priorities continued to put it at odds with the Ethnic Studies programs and

students of color. By the time Johnson wrote her report in Fall of 1971, the program was

already preparing itself for the possibility of protests against Subject A by Third World students

(Johnson, 1971b), with the knowledge that if this came to pass, it was highly likely that other

students would join the protests in solidarity and voice their frustrations over the ongoing

inequities around the $45 course fee and no-credit status. The Ethnic Studies programs in

particular took issue with the disproportionate amount of control that Subject A had over

students who needed to fulfill the requirement (Knight, 1971) and argued that Subject A not

only directed discriminatory practices against students of color, but that it also "forces minority

students into patterns of thinking and writing which are calculated to compromise their cultural

loyalties" (Knight, 1971, p. 2). Elaine Kim was a former teaching associate in the Subject A

program and graduate student in UC Berkeley's English department during the 1969-1970

academic year. She notes that although students who scored below 500 on their English

achievement test could test out of Subject A by writing an essay that would be read by

instructors who would determine whether they could be exempt from Subject A, the test was

culturally biased (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). Subject A instructors were,

according to Kim, "very proud of their essay topics, which they said were 'relevant' to 'youth'"

because they asked students to write about topics and people like Bob Dylan (Kim, Participant

Personal Communication, October 31, 2020). Yet, their refusal to recognize the cultural bias in

both the topics and the assessment criteria for the essay exam meant that the majority of

students who were held for Subject A were disproportionately Latino, Asian, and African

American (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). This was a significant problem because

there was no limit to the number of times that students could be held for Subject A: students

could be held term after term and forced to pay the $45 course fee each time with no units until

they passed the class. This practice was pervasive and applied so extensively to Asian American

students that the Subject A program began issuing what became known as the "Oriental D" to

students who had been held for Subject A repeatedly but who needed to pass the requirement in

their final term in order to graduate from Berkeley (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1,

2020). The racial biases that structured the Subject A requirement and the assessment practices

used by Subject A instructors were further compounded by the Subject A program's interest in

using the $45 course fees for economic gain. During her time as a teaching associate in the

Subject A program, Kim would hear Subject A instructors state openly in faculty meetings that

if they changed the English achievement score requirements on the College Board Test from

500 to 550 and held all students with English achievement scores of 550 and below for Subject

A, they could generate more FTE and money (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020).

Kim believed this policy was unfair and would negatively affect students of color who were

already disproportionately held for Subject A. To Kim, the work of the Subject A program and

133

Johnson's work "were clear examples of white supremacism at work" (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020; Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020).

During the 1970-1971 academic year, Kim was teaching both Asian Studies 3 and the Asian American section of Subject A in the Asian Studies division (Takagi, 1971). By this point, she had been conscienticized by the Third World Strike (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). She was advised by Paul Takagi to raise her concerns about the racist and white supremacist policies and practices in place in the Subject A program with Walter Knight, Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020; Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020). Kim wrote a letter to Knight on April 26, 1971 in which she raised critical questions about the extent to which Subject A was actually meeting the needs of and working in the best interest of Third World students (Takagi, 1971). Her concerns, as summarized by Paul Takagi (1971) included the following: whether students who needed to fulfill the Subject A requirement had full control over decisions about their coursework and schedules based on financial and educational considerations; the extent to which the university had established procedures to ensure that Subject A faculty (whose continued employment and course enrollment depended on students failing the Subject A exam) were evaluating Subject A exams fairly and to ensure that students had avenues to challenge their exam results; why failure rates and thus enrollment in Subject A had increased by over 400 students from the 1969-1970 academic year to the 1970-1971 academic year; whether there were differences in failure rates for the Subject A exam and course for students of color compared to white students; the extent to which Subject A took steps to ensure that the College Entrance Board Examination was not culturally biased and that their faculty were not culturally biased in their evaluation of student writing; and the extent to which Subject A was building composition courses specifically designed for students of color at both the K-12 and college levels. Kim was subsequently fired from Subject A for raising these concerns and for her failure to speak with

Johnson first about her concerns before writing to the dean — a move that Dean Knight viewed as a failure on Kim's part to "follow proper procedures" even though Kim had followed the advice of a tenured faculty member (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020; Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020).

The tensions between Subject A, Kim, and the Asian Studies division continued to grow deep enough that by the start of the Fall quarter of 1971, Dean Knight (1971) deemed it "a matter of campus-wide concern" (p. 1) that needed to be brought to the attention of the chancellor's office, the chairman of the Divisional Committee on Subject A, and the Statewide Committee on Subject A, with the Committee on Education Policy recommending that a system-wide review of Subject A and its administrative policies take place. By this point, the Asian Studies division was already in the final stages of what had been a two-year process of designing and reconceptualizing writing instruction with the intent that it should be able to establish, house, and fully control its own writing program without the interference of the Subject A department (Hayashi, 1971a). The division's full proposal (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971), "A College-level Reading and Composition Program for Students of Asian Descent: Diagnosis and Design," was presented in Summer of 1971 and built a compelling case for instituting a new, three-quarter sequence of reading and composition courses housed in the Asian Studies Division that would replace Asian Studies 3, Asian Studies 1A, and Asian Studies 1B. This new course sequence would fulfill both the Subject A and university reading and composition requirement. Citing the Subject A exam failure rates of Asian students, which at the time were twice as high as the failure rates for non-Asian students, the UC Berkeley Asian Studies division (1971) argued that both the pervasive stereotypes of Asian students as unassertive writers with deficient language skills and the assumption that instruction in grammar and mechanics could address those problems were damaging to students. According to the division, these stereotypes and the fixation on mastering grammar and form problematically

135

ignored the ways that both cultural values and the social, economic, and political realities of living in a racist society with a long history of silencing and othering Asian immigrants created a unique set of challenges for Asian students writers looking to develop their voices and sense of self (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971). In its proposal, the Asian Studies division examined the complex realities of Asian students' lived experiences both in and outside of the education system and in their communities, thus challenging the over-simplified forms of cultural essentialism that university administrators and the Subject A program had consistently used to characterize and denigrate Asian students' writing. Unlike the Subject A program, the Asian Studies division attempted to situate the unique challenges Asian students faced in writing courses within a comprehensive historical analysis of their social, educational, cultural, familial, and communicative experiences in both Asian culture and the xenophobic society in which they worked and lived in the U.S.

The division's analysis as presented in the final draft of the proposal (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971) was not without problems. In its proposal, the division attempted to situate the difficulties Asian students faced in their writing classes in the context of Asian cultural and familial values and forms of communication that prioritized deference to authority. Yet, its focus on deferential communication and linking cultural values to Asian students' perceived lack of individual voice and agency ignored the rich histories of Asian and Asian American resistance to repression and racism. The proposal notably neglected to discuss the significant role that the division's own Asian American students at Berkeley had played in the fight for Ethnic Studies and failed to account for the important forms of political analysis, literacy, argumentation, and visions these students had generated throughout the student movement and that they were continuing to generate in their organizing spaces. The analysis thus fed into the very forms of cultural essentialism and over-generalization that the division was trying to challenge.

Yet, the proposal for a new writing program in Asian Studies importantly set forth a new vision for academic writing that attempted to change radically how writing instruction could be conceptualized when it was no longer tied to notions of remediation or to the goal of having Asian American students master the details of sentence-level mechanics. Kim originally designed the division's vision for a three-quarter sequence of writing courses (Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020), and the division presenting the following courses in its final proposal: Asian Studies 3A (Asian American literature), Asian Studies 3B (Black, Native American, and Chicano Literature), and Asian Studies 3C (Asian, African, and Latin American Literature).[1] The three-course writing sequence prioritized Asian and Asian American students' capacities to develop their sense of self and values, to build a sense of the worth of their ideas, and to identify and evaluate critically both the problems in their communities and in the larger society with attention to the particularities of the Asian American experience as well as the shared experiences of "alienation, oppression, ferment, and struggle" among Third World communities of color (UC Berkeley Asian Studies 3A, B, C, 1971). Kim deliberately designed these courses to reflect how the division was thinking about the world and the contexts of Asian Americans both domestically and internationally at the time (Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020) with the intent that students would learn how to situate their own experiences in relation to their immediate communities and to the Third World. In doing so, students would not only learn how to "identify and understand the problems of [their] society and to formulate ways of acting constructively to solve them," but in the process of

---

[1] Although Kim had originally designed the Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C writing course sequence so that students would study Asian American literature in Asian Studies 3A; Black, Native American, and Chicano literature in Asian Studies 3B; and Asian, African, and Latin American literature in Asian Studies 3C (Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020), the proposal issued by the Asian Studies Division in 1971 offered a different sequence of course titles that did not reflect the specific local and international dimensions of Kim's original vision for the courses. The final proposal stipulated that students would learn about Asian American Identity and Personality in Asian Studies 3A, Asian American Literature in 3B, and Contemporary Asian American and Third World Literature in 3C (UC Berkeley Asian Studies 3A, B, C, 1971; UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971).

sharing their own experiences and reading about others' experiences through the study of literature, would also learn how to "work out [their] own sense of values that will give meaning and integrity to [their] li[ves]" (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, p. 23-24). The division maintained that if students had an interdisciplinary space (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, p. 26) to focus on critically analyzing and writing about issues that were immediately relevant to themselves and to the Asian American community, and if they were able to develop their own ways of understanding the complex social problems affecting both Asian Americans and other Third World communities in the world, then they would be better positioned to begin addressing and developing urgently needed interventions to solve these problems.

The division also sought to connect its commitment to building community studies and community languages to its new visions for academic reading and writing. The division believed that if students could learn community languages and begin to read, analyze, and write about community histories and literature written in their original languages, they could begin to dismantle the white supremacist language hierarchies in writing classes and in the education system that prioritized Standard English at the expense of community languages (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). Equipped with the knowledge of and respect for the community languages, histories, and literature of Third World communities and communities of color, students would subsequently be positioned to begin working in these communities. In these ways, composition courses in the Asian Studies division were inextricably connected to and in fact seen as essential to the political project of preparing students of color to work in and with their communities to create material and social change. As such, the division saw this sequence of courses not just as reading and writing classes, but as a crucial foundation for political study, self-growth, and empowerment that, according to the proposal, would be required of all Asian American Studies majors and recommended for non-major students who wanted to enroll in other Asian American Studies courses. At the heart of this proposal was the

realization that writing courses could become sites of both personal, political, and social transformation instead of classes that continued to participate in the reproduction of disciplinary practices and skills that had historically disenfranchised Asian American students. In these courses, students could engage in experiential writing and interdisciplinary study in service of analyzing and confronting larger social and political issues of pressing importance to themselves, to their communities, and to other communities of color. In these writing classes, every student of color was seen as someone who could develop their political consciousness and contribute in meaningful ways towards solving pressing issues in society.

To ensure that this course sequence would not be seen as remedial in nature, the Asian Studies division (1971) structured it differently from Subject A. The division's previous Asian Studies 3-1A-1B course sequence had been set up so students would fulfill the Subject A requirement in one course (Asian Studies 3) specifically designated to cover the "remedial material" in one term. Unlike the earlier sequence, however, Asian Studies 3A, 3B, and 3C were each set up as regular courses, with the so-called "remedial" writing material designed as a separate program that would run alongside the main three-course sequence and be open to all students regardless of whether they needed to fulfill the Subject A requirement or not. This setup was established to remove the existing stigmas surrounding Subject A and courses specifically designated as "Subject A equivalent" courses: students could now enroll separately in the supplemental writing course, which was comprised of group-based tutoring whose course content complemented the main 3A-3B-3C course sequence and could participate in weekly hour-long individual meetings with the course instructor to discuss their work (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Appendix C). By allowing students to pass out of the supplemental program at their own pace (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, p. 27), the division hoped to establish a writing program that would fully support students and prioritize their developing sense of self and self-expression rather than reproducing the forms of

marginalization and systemic racism that the traditional Subject A courses subscribed to. In fact, the stated goals of Asian Studies 3A (Asian American Identity and Personality) were "1) to redress previous imbalances in the students' educational background by studying hitherto neglected aspects of Asian American history and culture, 2) to provide a perspective through which students may analyze racial problems threatening our society, and 3) to develop basic analytical and communication skills with which students may more effectively pursue future studies" (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Appendix C). This design deliberately moved away from remediation and thus opened up the space needed in the 3A-3B-3C courses to focus on helping students develop their sense of self and their ability to analyze pressing social and political problems relevant to Asian Americans through experiential knowledge and interdisciplinary analysis. In turn, student writing and writing instruction could emerge directly from and work in service of the students' critical analysis of social issues and the situated understandings they were constructing about their communities. Under this new structure, reading and writing would be the start of helping students to become active participants in their communities and in society rather than merely serving as a convenient tool for reproducing technical skills and disciplinary forms.

The Asian Studies division did not develop this proposal in isolation. The ongoing tensions between Subject A and the ethnic studies students and faculty that had been escalating since 1968 were the immediate context that drove the division to propose the three-quarter sequence. Yet, the division also sought the input of Asian American students, faculty, community organizations and leaders, parents, and educators across the K-12, California State, and University of California systems over a two-year period to ensure that the writing program they developed would be relevant to students and their communities, and could respond to the ongoing racism against and marginalization of Asian Americans in the education system and society (Hayashi, 1971a; UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Appendix D). Formal

endorsements for Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C and feedback on Asian Studies division's course sequence proposal came from California State College Dominguez Hills, the National Education Committee of the Japanese American Citizens League, the Westside Community Mental Health Center, *Pacific Citizen*, California Asian American Studies Central, the Asian Community Center, the University of British Columbia Department of English, *Hokubei Mainichi*, the Asian American Studies Center at the University of California Los Angeles, Asian American Studies in the Berkeley Unified School District, the Board of Directors of the East Bay Chinese Youth Council, the Adult English as a Second Language Program at Castelar Elementary School in the Los Angeles City School District, *Gidra*, and Asian American Studies at California State College Long Beach (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Appendix D).

The responses were overwhelmingly positive, with Asian American educators such as Glen Watanabe and Linda Wing from the Berkeley Unified School District (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Appendix D) noting that they recognized the urgent need for such classes, having witnessed the same damaging and alienating effects of racism and stereotypes against Asian Americans in their work with Asian American high school students. Community organizations such as the Asian Community Center arguing that the proposed courses were a reflection of the "self definition and self determination of Asian American People" as they attempted to reclaim their histories and to establish control over their education (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Appendix D). Consistent among the responses was the recognition that the Asian Studies division was attempting to build a new model of instruction that worked with Asian American students' cultural and linguistic heritages in innovative and meaningful ways in the context of writing instruction. The community organizations and programs that endorsed the proposal understood that this course sequence paved the way for new pedagogical, educational, and political possibilities that would not be possible in grammar- and skills-based writing courses. This was a model that, as Glen Omatsu of *Hokubei Minichi* put it, would be

capable of "tear[ing] down the barriers to communication among Asian students that have been built through years of prejudice and mis-treatment" (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Appendix D). In these ways, local organizations lent their full support to the Asian Studies division, as they recognized the importance of how the division was reconceptualizing writing instruction in order to make visible and rectify the long history of injustices against Asian Americans. Ronald M. Hirano, Director of the National Education Committee of the Japanese American Citizens League, offered a clear explanation of the larger historical significance and great promise of this work in educational contexts:

> At present, the schools have not been able to effectively serve minority students … For minority students, there are two mistaken assumptions in the rationale for Subject A and traditional reading and composition courses. The first is that the educational system is generally suited to the needs of all its students, and the onus of any deficiencies must lie within the student. For the Asian student already struggling with his unique role as an ethnic minority, Subject A with all of the negative connotations of a remedial program, which coincidentally includes many of his peers, casts a second class status to that role. The second assumption is that approaches and curricula which have failed to produce the desired results for 12 years at the elementary and secondary school level will now work in the University. There is an obvious need for innovative approaches with promise of better results. The Asian Studies sequence is a new approach … It does not attempt to develop language skills as an isolated ability, but rather it tries to utilize the background and culture of the individual student. (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Appendix D)

These letters of support revealed the degree to which this new vision for writing courses was needed and enthusiastically embraced by members of the Asian American community who saw the struggles Asian American students faced against structural and linguistic racism as deeply tied to the struggles of the larger community. Several of the letters, however, simultaneously showed just how embedded the discourses of remediation and deficiency were in discussions of education and offered a glimpse into the ongoing difficulties the Asian Studies division would face in challenging the deficit-based discourses commonly associated with remedial writing courses. Even as Asian American educators and community organizations embraced the Asian Studies division's vision and recognized the urgency of moving away from

remedial writing instruction to build Asian American students' sense of self, racial history, and self-determination, some simultaneously wrote that they believed these courses would effectively address "mechanics" (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Letter from Tanaka in Appendix D) and "language deficiencies among minority students" (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Letter from Hata, Jr. in Appendix D). Although they recognized the need to situate Asian students' experiences in Subject A writing classes within larger histories of racialized oppression, they maintained that "while the substance of the proposed course differs from those prescribed in the English Department, the tools for self-expression through the mastery of the written and spoken English are the same" (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, Letter from Honda in Appendix D). The effect was thus an odd tension within the endorsement letters between stakeholders' seemingly clear understanding of the division's need to break free of the damaging, grammar-focused standards and practices in traditional writing programs that reproduced linguistic racism, and their tendency to fall back onto the assumption that Asian American students' linguistic practices were somehow deficient and needed to be fixed because they failed to conform to standard English. Some community supporters thus continued to believe that students' ability to master standard English and mechanics was a critical priority even as the Asian Studies division explicitly stated in its proposal that it intended to prioritize students' sense of self-definition and self-determination as the foundation from which non-remedial and non-deficit-based approaches to writing and writing instruction would emerge.

There were unexpected delays in obtaining approval from the Committee on Courses to run the new Asian Studies classes, including a request from the Committee that the Asian Studies division lower the unit value for each portion of the sequence from five units to three units and change Asian Studies 3A from five units of credit to no credit at all (Doyle, 1971a). Yet, Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C: "The Asian Experience in America" was finally approved by the

Committee on Courses for the 1971-1972 academic year as a five-unit (15 units total), credit-bearing course that would meet for three hours per week for lecture and one hour per week for tutorials (UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies/Contemporary Asian Studies, 1971). To avoid the ongoing disagreements with the university over whether students fulfilling the Subject A requirement should be charged a fee and given units, and in keeping with its repeated assertions that its writing sequence was not remedial, the Asian Studies division offered individual and small group workshops that would run alongside the 3A-3B-3C courses and focus on writing instruction. These writing workshops would be completely voluntary for students and taught by faculty and tutors voluntarily (Hayashi, 1971a). Students would then need to pass an essay exam to fulfill the Subject A requirement, which would be assessed by Subject A and Asian Studies faculty as well as by the Committee on Subject A (Hayashi, 1971a). The committee approved twelve total sections of the course sequence to run for that academic year (Doyle, 1971b), and the Asian Studies Division hired Patrick Hayashi (graduate student in the School of Public Affairs and instructor for Asian Studies 3), Elaine Kim (instructor for Asian Studies 3 and Subject A and the instructor who had originally designed the three-course sequence), Colin Watanabe (former editor of *Gidra*), and Dale Minami (graduate of what was formerly known as Boalt Law School and tutor for Asian students at Boalt) to teach the sections for the academic year (UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies/Contemporary Asian Studies, 1971; UC Berkeley Asian Studies, 1971). Within the fall and winter quarters of the 1971-1972 academic year alone, the division served over 250 students across seven sections of Asian Studies 3A and five sections of 3B (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1972).

The Ongoing Impacts and Fundamental Misunderstandings of the Politics of Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C's Vision for Writing Instruction

The Asian Studies division's success in establishing its own writing courses led to significant changes in how the other ethnic studies programs conceptualized writing instruction and remediation. In January 1972, Asian Studies began working with the School of Education to co-sponsor a summer class for high school teachers on Third World literature (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1972). This project opened opportunities for the division to begin working directly with secondary teachers on developing pedagogical approaches and curriculum for teaching Third World literature in high schools. Within the Ethnic Studies programs, Chicano Studies and Native American Studies followed Asian Studies's lead and took steps to rethink their own reading and composition course offerings. Shortly after Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C launched, the Chicano Studies Curriculum Committee met in January 1972 to discuss Chicano Studies and the Subject A requirement (UC Berkeley Chicano Studies, 1972a) and developed their own proposal for a three-quarter extended reading and composition sequence called Chicano Studies 2A-2B-2C, which was modeled after the reading and composition courses developed by the Asian Studies division (UC Berkeley Chicano Studies, 1972b). Like the Asian Studies division, faculty in the Chicano Studies program were concerned with the lack of confidence their students felt in their own writing and believed that damaging stereotypes of multilingual Chicano students and the students' complex experiences with their cultural identities were contributing to the ongoing challenges they faced in English courses (UC Berkeley Chicano Studies 1972b). The proposed three-course sequence in Chicano Studies (1972b) would, like Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C, focus on moving away from instructor-driven topics and instead give students the space to write about their experiences through narratives, memoir, and historical writing, which the faculty believed would better support students in developing both their confidence and their approaches to composition. In its proposal, the Chicano Studies program argued that "expository and argumentative writing spring from a base of confidence: social, individual, linguistic, from a sense that one can deal with things most nearly felt and experienced

so that one is then ready to try more abstract themes for a more abstract audience" (UC Berkeley Chicano Studies 1972b, p. 3-4). The program maintained that making writing not just relevant but also "a satisfying personal experience" was crucial for dismantling conventional writing programs' tendency to teach writing as "a task structure to be filled with current cliché attitudes, unexamined and never supported or clarified by individual insight" (UC Berkeley Chicano Studies, 1972b, p. 4). In its proposal, the program acknowledged that the need for this sequence and its vision for writing instruction was pressing enough that the faculty had voted unanimously to support the push for these lower-division courses even at the expense of offering new upper-division courses (UC Berkeley Chicano Studies, 1972b, p. 3). By focusing on students' personal and intellectual growth through experiential writing, Chicano Studies hoped to build a foundation both for students' continued work in the program, and for the rest of the Chicano Studies curriculum. The Native American Studies program, which had just begun to offer its own 1A and 1B courses, submitted its proposal in Fall of 1973 for a Subject A-equivalent course with its proposed budget for the 1974-1975 academic year (UC Berkeley Native American Studies, 1973).

The ongoing conflicts between the Subject A program and Asian Studies division that had led up to the proposal for, and eventual establishment of, Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C also set in motion a system-wide evaluation of all Subject A and reading and composition programs on each UC campus that began in Fall of 1971 (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1972; Stanley, 2010), led by Ralph Turner (Chairman of the University-wide Committee on Educational Policy) and Jay Martin (Chair of the UC Irvine Committee on Educational Policy). The charge of the appointed sub-committees on each campus and the systemwide committee was to investigate whether Subject A was still useful as a requirement, and whether there were alternative ways of structuring both the requirement and the course (Stanley, 2010). As there was the possibility that the committee could recommend that Subject A be eliminated altogether, the stakes of this

evaluation were high. In a letter to Brendan O'Hehir, chair of the Committee on Educational Policy-Remedial Education, Jay Margulies (1971), a tutor for EOP, complained that one of the students he tutored was required for her final Subject A assignment to write a letter to the Academic Senate Chairman of the Committee of Courses in which she was supposed to argue that Subject A should be given course credit. Given the timing of the assignment and the fact that the committee was in the process of reviewing Subject A, Margulies saw this assignment and its expectation that students write favorably about the course ("Ninth Essay Topic Subject A," 1971) as a violation of ethical conduct and students' right to academic freedom. For the Ethnic Studies programs and the Asian Studies division in particular, the comprehensive review of Subject A meant that Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C and its unconventional objectives and approaches to teaching writing to students of color were also being carefully considered in relation to Subject A. In its final report, known as the Turner-Martin Report, the University-wide Committee on Educational Policy issued nine recommendations for the system-wide administration and design of the Subject A requirement and courses. Several of these recommendations were in fact practices that the Asian Studies division had long fought for, designed, and already implemented in its own courses (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1972; Turner & Martin, 1972). These included the abolishment of the $45 fee; the granting of university credit for classes in which opportunities to fulfill the Subject A requirements were built into coursework that would otherwise earn credit; the attempt to work with high schools on strengthening their writing instruction; and the concerted effort by departments to make writing instruction a priority for all students (Turner & Martin, 1972).

The system-wide adoption of several of the policies and practices that Ethnic Studies faculty and students, and particularly the AASU and Asian Studies division, had fought to establish over the years formally affirmed the Ethnic Studies department's efforts to lead the charge in shifting the dialogue about and administration of writing courses within the UC

system. Yet, this success overshadowed the fact that neither the UC Berkeley Subject A Sub-Committee (which was tasked by the Committee on Educational Policy with examining Subject A on Berkeley's campus) nor the University-wide Committee on Educational Policy took up the Ethnic Studies department's most important arguments about writing instruction for students of color. In its 1972 report on the status of Subject A at Berkeley, the UC Berkeley's Subject A Sub-Committee (1972) offered a series of six recommendations to improve the quality of Subject A. These recommendations included maintaining a statewide requirement for reading and writing proficiency; completing this proficiency requirement as early as in high school; designing a new exam to assess reading and writing proficiency; incorporating Subject A-equivalent courses into regular, credit-bearing courses to bypass fee and credit restrictions; supporting diverse ways of teaching writing; and ensuring coordination among different departments offering Subject A courses.

The UC Berkeley Department of Ethnic Studies Reading and Composition Committee (1972) expressed concern with the first three recommendations, arguing that designing an exam and using one statewide standard to evaluate students' writing abilities in high school failed to address the cultural biases and structural racism built into high school tracking systems and standardized testing and evaluation, thus putting students of color at a disadvantage. The committee also took issue with several of the Subject A sub-committee's alternative recommendations: members of the committee rejected the recommendation that the university offer probationary admissions dependent on successful completion of a summer Subject A course on the grounds that such a class would likely "degenerate into a remedial grammar clinic, attempting to treat surface flaws but not reaching out to develop any deep logic of self-expression" (p. 4). They further argued that the recommendation to house all writing instruction in a new Department of Instruction in Language Arts would undermine the ethnic studies writing courses whose successes, according to the Ethnic Studies Reading and Composition

148

Committee, were attributable to the autonomy each division had in controlling the content and pedagogical approaches of its classes to meet the unique needs, interests, and backgrounds of its students. At the heart of the concerns that the Ethnic Studies Reading and Composition Committee raised was the fact that the Sub-Committee had repeatedly ignored the core vision of the Asian Studies division's writing course sequence. This was not the first time that the division had raised these concerns to Roger Hahn, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Subject A (Hayashi, 1971b) and was forced to re-explain its commitment to building writing classes that deliberately rejected traditional approaches to teaching and conceptualizing literacy and writing proficiency. While the university more readily accepted administrative changes like removing the $45 fee and agreeing to offer university credit for courses in which students could fulfill the Subject A requirement, it was less inclined to adopt the ideologies and politics driving the Ethnic Studies department's visions of writing instruction. More specifically, the university refused to acknowledge or take the necessary steps to rectify the long history of injustices and systemic racism that structured both the K-12 education system and its own academic writing program. Although the AASU, Afro-American Studies program, and Asian Studies division had clearly exposed the racist dimensions of skills-based remediation and successfully designed and implemented innovative models of writing instruction, the university never rejected the original disciplinary frameworks or deficit models of writing instruction that structured Subject A, nor did it force the university writing program to change the racist pedagogies and assessment practices that continued to disenfranchise multilingual students of color. Ultimately, the Berkeley Subject A Sub-Committee did not revise any of its recommendations or alternative recommendations based on the Ethnic Studies Committee's analysis: the University-wide Committee on Educational Policy's final recommendations in the Turner-Martin Report reflected unchanged positions on the importance of maintaining Subject A's current instructional form, developing a university-wide exam and standard for assessment, and

149

establishing a centralized office that would oversee the efforts of different departments to offer courses to satisfy the Subject A requirement (Turner & Martin, 1972).

A brief examination of Subject A's approaches to teaching and assessing student writing in the years following the release of the Turner-Martin Report shows that the Committee on Educational Policy's recommended policy changes did not address what the Ethnic Studies Reading and Composition Committee had considered to be critical issues and practices at stake in the inquiry into Subject A. The new supervisor of Subject A, Phyllis Brooks (1973), developed course assignments and materials for her Fall 1973 Subject A class that reveal that students were still focusing on and being tested on grammar. Although many of the discussions about grammar took place at the start of the semester and although Brooks gave students specialized instruction for their work during individual tutoring sessions, the course content was still structured around the reproduction of disciplinary norms and middle-class values. The eight essays that Brooks assigned for the class included paraphrasing and translating passages of texts, developing definition essays of words, writing from the perspectives and voices of different people to new audiences, conducting observations of individuals, using the argumentative techniques employed by the authors of course texts, and applying a concept in the readings to their own experiences. Course readings and assignments still presumed that students came from white, middle-class backgrounds, as evidenced, for instance, both in the first writing assignment which asked students to write as a 23-year old airline stewardess about how airplanes fly, and in course handouts with passages written in Middle English that students were to use for writing exercises. The only writers of color included in the course syllabus were S.I. Hayakawa and James Baldwin, but their work was used only to the extent that students were asked to write about a concept Hayakawa had defined and to engage in a writing exercise on the use of parenthetical expression in Baldwin's work.

While the materials for Brooks's course are not necessarily representative of what students were learning and doing in other sections of Subject A that year, they still speak to the concerns that the Ethnic Studies faculty and students had been voicing for years and that were more thoroughly explained and theorized in the Asian Studies division's proposal for 3A-3B-3C: most of the Subject A classes were not set up as part of a larger political project meant to challenge the structural inequities in the education system that had disenfranchised and silenced students of color, nor were they designed to help students of color build the knowledge, skills, and sense of self-identity needed to analyze these social injustices critically and to help their communities. Kimberly Davis's (1975) Report on Subject A at UC Berkeley two years later showed that the pass/fail rates from 1971-1975 did not change significantly for students of color during this time period. While the percentage of non-minority students who passed the Subject A course was regularly at 90% or above, the percentage of Black, Chicano, and Native American students who passed the course each academic year during this time period was much lower. Only 59.2%—79.3% of Black students, 61.5%—72.7% of Chicano students, and 25% to 70% of Native American students passing the course each year (Davis, 1975). Davis (1975) maintained that the open-ended structure of the Subject A essay exams were meant to give students as much space as possible to show their capabilities, and evaluators were instructed to remember that students were not expected to produce completely polished work since they would each take two additional writing courses even after passing Subject A as part of the university writing requirement. However, the evaluation criteria presented in Davis's report suggests that grammar and mechanics were still a primary consideration for whether a student passed or not, as students with more than six grammatical errors were typically required to take the Subject A course, while students with more than fifteen errors were forced to attend supplemental instruction such as tutoring. In these ways, Subject A courses continued to focus primarily on ensuring that students could "write a coherently organized and convincingly argued

expository essay that is reasonably free from errors in standard grammar and usage" (Davis, 1975, p. 2). They prioritized the very evaluation criteria — grammatical accuracy — that the ethnic studies programs and Asian Studies division in particular had long argued was a racist form of remediation that marginalized and silenced students of color.

Although the Subject A program and the Turner-Martin committee did not necessarily share the Ethnic Studies department's understanding of the full significance and goals of its writing sequence, the Asian Studies division — later known as Contemporary Asian Studies — finally received recognition during the first review of the Ethnic Studies Department in 1973 for the important work and resources it had devoted to transforming writing instruction for its students. The Ad Hoc Committee to Review Ethnic Studies, which became known as the Collins Committee, was charged by Chancellor Albert H. Bowker (1972) with conducting a comprehensive review of the department. The committee was asked to assess how the department's curricula compared to the curricula of similar departments and whether the department had developed "innovative educational approaches, especially in relation to ethnic communities" (Bowker, 1972). Despite the fact that Afro-American Studies, Chicano Studies, and Contemporary Asian Studies had all developed their own writing courses either within their own programs or in the Subject A program, the Collins Committee focused its discussion of teaching innovations in writing instruction on the Contemporary Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C course sequence (Collins, 1973). In describing the writing sequence, the Collins Committee stated that "there can be little doubt that this is a good course and it has fulfilled a real need of Asian American students" (Collins, 1973, p. 17). The committee also recognized that the instructors hired to teach the sequence — Hayashi, Watanabe, Kim, and Minami — were "some of the best and most devoted instructors in the division" (p. 17). Unlike the Turner-Martin Report, which focused largely on assessing how individual campuses were working towards the standardization of writing instruction across the UC system, the original report issued by the subcommittee

152

tasked with reviewing the Ethnic Studies curricula (Dekker & Romano, 1973) indicated that the subcommittee members saw the value of the 3A-3B-3C writing sequence in terms of the larger social and political contexts and goals that informed its design. In its report, the subcommittee highlighted that 3A-3B-3C had been established with the intent of not only addressing the specific forms of silencing that Asian Americans endured in their own culture and while living in a racist society, but also of responding directly to the material, linguistic, housing, and health needs in Asian American communities. Though the committee's review of the writing sequence's political contexts and goals was generally positive, the Collins Committee did, however, offer sharp criticism of the $45 fee waiver for 3A, which had not been extended to students enrolled in Subject A classes despite the recommendations of the Turner-Martin Report (1972). The committee conceded that "part of the popularity [of the 3A-3B-3C sequence] may stem from the fact that C.A.S. 3A is the cheapest way of satisfying the Reading and Composition requirement of Letters and Sciences in a congenial and sympathetic environment" (Collins, 1973, p. 17). It recommended that Contemporary Asian Studies eliminate the $45 fee waiver until all students enrolled in Subject A or Subject A-equivalent classes could be granted a similar waiver.

Subsequent external reviews that discussed the reading and composition offerings in Ethnic Studies and particularly within the Asian American Studies program were less favorable than the Collins Committee findings. The Brinner Committee (1980) acknowledged that the university's long history of linguistic racism in traditional departments towards Asian and Asian American students had led to the substantial development of undergraduate writing courses in the early years of the program. Yet, the report framed this largely as a linguistic matter now tied to Asian American Studies's community language requirements and only recommended that instructors in the university's English as a Foreign Language program be trained to understand

the "special problems — non-linguistic in this instance — of some of the foreign-born and bilingual students" (p. 168).

It was not until the 1992 external review that the Ethnic Studies department was given substantive feedback about its reading and composition courses. The Kirkpatrick/Stack committee (1992) readily acknowledged the significant role the Ethnic Studies department had played in transforming writing instruction on the Berkeley campus, noting that as the only department that offered both Subject A and reading and composition courses, the department's innovations in curricular design and academic support programs for its students had "in many cases anticipated the need for institutional changes within the University itself and … created models for those changes" (p. 185). As a result, other departments on campus were eventually able to establish their own reading and composition classes that could now serve the needs of a diverse student population (p. 210). Undergraduate students who met with the committee conducting the external review of the department spoke forcefully about the importance of offering Subject A and reading and composition classes in the Ethnic Studies department, citing the relationships they had built with faculty who cared about their work as critical factors that contributed positively to not only their transitions from high school to the university, but also to their overall experiences as undergraduates (Gutierrez, Nakanishi & Roberts, 1992).

The innovative advances that the department had made in writing instruction, however, were not necessarily seen by the members of either the campus review committee or the external review committee as central to the department's priorities moving forward. Comments from department faculty revealed that the faculty were deeply divided about the importance of these courses. Some faculty and academic advisors felt strongly that the writing courses should continue to be housed in the department and be granted regular FTE because the university and writing courses in other departments were still failing to serve the specific needs of the students enrolled in these courses (Kirkpatrick & Stack, 1992). However, the junior faculty who taught

the writing courses viewed them as "service" courses that were "inadequately funded and generally deemed of little merit in the formal academic review process" (Gutierrez, Nakanishi & Roberts, 1992, p. 226). As such, in both the Kirkpatrick/Stack Report (1992) and the report of Gutierrez, Nakanishi and Roberts (1992), members of the review committee raised questions about the extent to which writing courses should continue to be housed in the department. The Kirkpatrick/Stack Report (1992) raised the possibility that the department's service courses and the university's programs, including writing, academic counseling, and outreach, were aligned enough that the university could take over these responsibilities, but the members of the Kirkpatrick/Stack committee never reached a clear decision about whether they actually endorsed this proposal for eliminating "special services" from departmental oversight. However, Gutierrez, Nakanishi, and Roberts (1992) were direct in their assessment that it was inappropriate for Ethnic Studies to be devoting resources to "university services that properly belong elsewhere" (p. 226). Arguing that the university was "over dependen[t]" on the Ethnic Studies department to "manage its minority affairs" (p. 226), the committee expressed concern that the department's focus on Subject A and writing instruction came at the expense of the department's junior faculty, who, because of their obligation to teach Subject A, felt unable meet the university's standards for "the proper balance of research, teaching, and service" (Gutierrez, Nakanishi & Roberts, 1992, p. 226-227).

In its response to the Kirkpatrick/Stack Report, the Ethnic Studies department focused on addressing the more urgent issue of the committee's recommendations about the institutional placement of the department and did not formally address the review committee's comments about its writing courses (Wang, 1992). Yet, the points that the Kirkpatrick/Stack committee and junior faculty in the department had made about the service nature of these classes as well as the committee's recommendation that other departments absorb the responsibility of both offering and overseeing Subject A were telling. What the committee failed to see was that writing courses

within the Ethnic Studies department, beginning with the first Subject A writing course on black literature that the AASU and Sarah Webster Fabio had brought into being in 1968, had always been conceptualized with the understanding that these classes were meant to do more important work than to teach writing as a neutral tool for reproducing disciplinary forms and conventions. The department had created these classes in response to students' understanding that writing and literacy were deeply political and that, when reenvisioned to make these politics visible, these courses could play a central role in helping students of color build the knowledge, understandings, and critical analysis of their histories and society that they needed to engage in meaningful work in their lives and with their communities. These writing courses directly challenged the racist frameworks, pedagogies, and perceptions of multilingual students that structured the Subject A program, and by speaking to the lived experiences and realities of their students, helped students construct the analytical skills, histories, and contexts they would need to solve the problems their communities faced.

As courses that were designed and redesigned as part of larger political efforts to challenge the assimilationist project in university writing programs, Ethnic Studies writing classes were simply not interchangeable with university writing classes housed in departments whose primary goals were to ensure students could master linguistic forms and disciplinary conventions. Their work had always been a direct response to and exposure of Subject A's (and by extension, the university's) ongoing investment in assimilation and in reducing writing to the reproduction of "standard" English and disciplinary logics. As such, the department's writing courses were meant to challenge the notion of writing as remediation by opening spaces where writing could instead emerge from and work in service of the long-term goals of self-determination and social transformation for the masses outside of academia. As Floyd Huen's (1970) brief paper regarding the motivations and rationale behind his course proposal for an Asian Studies research and writing methodology course makes clear, Asian American students

156

believed that the traditional forms and expectations of writing instruction — even if housed and taught in the division of Asian Studies — imposed real restrictions on their work,. Instead, they envisioned designing writing classes that would work towards different goals. Students criticized Huen's original course proposal for being too focused on methodology at the expense of offering a political perspective, arguing that because "learning research and paper-writing methodology would be copying the Man and becoming more like him," they instead needed to "be more innovative in our research and teaching, so that students will not be socially-controlled, and will develop their critical thinking abilities" (Huen, 1970, p. 1). Their response compelled Huen to revise his proposal and to argue that, instead of learning to write and research to master existing methods that "perpetuate ruling class ideology" (p. 2), it was critical for students to gain enough familiarity with these techniques so that they could be positioned to analyze critically and begin developing alternative tools and counter-ideologies to move their political and movement-based work forward. He stated that,

> Learning research and paper-writing is essential to gaining an understanding of what is being done, *and from there, we can construct what needs to still be done*. In other words, students need to be able to understand, and analyze the current bull shit in the University and most of academia, and even more importantly, to be able to relate this bull shit to existing political conditions. From there, the student can begin to understand present and past reality. I believe that enough opposition to existing bull shit already exists, but there is not enough full understanding of why it exists, and exactly what does exist. It is easy, then, to understands why very little "alternative" techniques, and new methods have emerged from this campus, and others. A lack of understanding makes alternative creation very difficult. Learning techniques is not becoming like the Man, simply because the techniques we should learn should enable us to better understand the man; obviously, not the same techniques will be learned. Thus, we want to do something the Man never would do: think and express ourselves critically and create critically … (Huen, 1970, p. 1, italicized emphasis added)

Huen and others disagreed about the extent to which conventional research techniques needed to be understood in order to construct new methods and approaches to research: some students argued that alternatives could "develop out of isolation" (p. 1), while Huen believed students needed to have a foundational understanding of existing disciplinary conventions in

order to build alternative methods. Yet, central to both Huen's proposal and his colleagues' visions was the understanding that to counter the traditional research methods that maintained current power structures and to move towards their own goals, they needed to construct new research, pedagogies, writing techniques, methods, and ways of thinking that did not yet exist. Despite the Kirkpatrick/Stack committee's attempts to acknowledge the Ethnic Studies department's rich history of developing timely innovations in writing instruction within its different programs, Huen's paper helps to make clear that the committee did not fully understand the extent to which the underlying philosophies, politics, and movement-based interests driving the department's writing courses were always fundamentally at odds with how writing was understood and taught in other departments.

Conclusion

Huen's (1970) proposed research and writing methodology class was never approved, but it offers a glimpse into how Asian American students reenvisioned the work of writing and research courses and the history of how students and faculty of color fought to establish their own writing classes in the Ethnic Studies department at UC Berkeley. More importantly, it helps to illustrate why current efforts to address the needs of diverse student populations in writing programs have largely fallen short of their intended goals. Academic writing programs have not had to change the underlying ideologies that structure university reading, writing, and research standards, even as they make concerted efforts to change course content, include multicultural texts in their course curriculum, and launch diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. The curricular and pedagogical modifications that have gained popularity in the field of composition studies have allowed writing programs, administrators, and instructors alike to subscribe to the same processes, techniques, and conceptual frameworks that have long defined writing studies and disproportionately marginalized students of color through the rhetoric of remediation. Yet, the

early Afro-American Studies, Asian Studies, Chicano Studies, and Native American Studies programs' ongoing fight for autonomy and control over their own writing courses at UC Berkeley in the late 1960s and early 1970s illustrates that more is needed to serve students of color. Black and Asian American students and faculty made clear that if university writing classes were still invested in the project of assimilation and expected students to demonstrate their literacy through their ability to master linguistic forms and writing genres, then they were not working in the interests of students of color. At the root of the students' vision for writing courses was the understanding that they should help students do meaningful work in their lives. At the time, this meant helping students to analyze critically the problems in their communities and in the Third World, and to connect writing and literacy to the study of history, community languages, and literature so they would be positioned to make meaningful contributions to their communities and to solve the racial inequities and socioeconomic challenges that their communities faced. To this end, they did not prioritize perfecting the supposedly race-neutral skills or techniques the university believed they needed to master, but rather focused on figuring out how to build new methods and ways of conceptualizing what counted as literacy so that writing and research could emerge from and directly respond to their collective experiences of racial oppression and struggle. The students connected their critical analysis of structural racism to a larger vision of and commitment to social transformation and political praxis that necessitated, as Huen (1970) put it, "innovating in our research and teaching" and developing tools and alternative techniques that had not yet been formulated so they could "construct what still needs to be done" (p. 1). In this context, then, the movement that the students and faculty in the Afro-American Studies, Asian Studies, La Raza Studies, and Native American Studies programs started in order to design and control their own writing classes offered an important way of reconceptualizing what it meant for writing programs and writing classes to work towards racial justice and social transformation for communities of color. Their work exposed

the unequal racial power structures and politics of remediation in academic writing classes and demonstrated that they could use writing to respond to community struggles and to contribute to meaningful change in society through their collective visions for what was possible.

Chapter Three: "A Class that Changes You … That Transforms You …": Reconstructing the Contexts of Transformative Pedagogy in Academic Writing Classes

UC Berkeley's Asian American Studies writing classes offered a clear pedagogical model in the early 1970s that university writing programs could follow in order to serve students of color. By redefining academic writing as a political project where students could connect writing to the study of community languages, literature, history, and racial inequities both at home and abroad, Asian American Studies writing instructors demonstrated that writing classes could become transformative spaces where students of color could understand the urgent problems their communities were facing and build the skills needed to solve these problems. Yet, fifty years after the program first introduced these innovations, the field of composition studies continues to struggle to address the underlying racial inequities that structure its discipline and disciplinary practices. Although diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives at the campus-wide and departmental levels have inspired the widespread rethinking of composition pedagogy and practices, these initiatives encourage writing instructors to continue working within the familiar ideological and conceptual boundaries of learning outcomes and disciplinary norms. Within this context, writing instructors are expected to apply a core set of pedagogical practices widely across different contexts and populations while using standardized learning outcomes and rubrics to assess all student work, regardless of students' diverse needs, backgrounds, and experiences.

Yet, this approach fails to recognize that the real task at hand is much more complex. As Gutierrez, Larson, and Kreuter (1995) remind us, although students come to their classrooms with varied perspectives, experiences, and knowledge, the academic classroom as an educational space reproduces "the socialization practices and dominant forms of caregiving of middle-class families" (p. 411) by tying educational goals, pedagogical methods, and curriculum to classroom

scripts that reinforce middle-class values and definitions of what counts as learning. In effect, writing programs that require instructors to adopt purportedly universal pedagogical practices often overlook and suppress the complex cultural knowledge and forms of literacy that students of color bring to their work. As students learn to master established disciplinary processes and skills in order to meet performance standards, the writing classroom thus becomes a reactive space where students are expected simply to learn and reproduce middle-class skills that rarely align with their cultural knowledge and ways of learning. Students may be able to share aspects of their backgrounds and knowledge, but these insights are rarely relevant to the work they are expected to produce. University writing programs have thus faced considerable difficulty envisioning and teaching academic writing proactively and dynamically. In classrooms where they are pushed to master form and skills, students have few opportunities to construct the relevant contexts and methodologies necessary to problem-solve and intervene in urgent issues that affect their lives. For a field that has traditionally prioritized and been expected to teach students how to *write about* and *report on* issues rather than to *problem-solve* and *design*, it is crucial to consider what could happen if writing instructors were to begin situating their work with students of color within and in response to the social worlds in which students live and from which they come. If writing instructors begin to reenvision the work of academic writing so that students have opportunities to work together to build collective and intersubjective forms of analysis and situated understandings of issues where there is something at stake, students of color can begin to construct the analytical skills, methodologies, and contexts necessary to drive pedagogical and social transformation.

Part of the difficulty writing program instructors face in their efforts to work towards racial and social justice in the composition classroom is their mandate within the neoliberal university to teach towards standardized learning outcomes and transferrable reading and writing skills. While most outcomes-based methods and conceptual frameworks in academic writing

162

classes are designed to help all students meet standard learning outcomes efficiently, they have not necessarily been designed to account for the methods or contexts that actually matter to students of color as they work and learn. Instead, these methods are designed to focus almost exclusively on the production of an end product recognizable to the discipline and thus fail to consider that the most important contexts and processes for learning may have nothing to do with traditional learning outcomes or measurable skills. Research on writing instruction at the community college level, for instance, indicates that although instructors are deeply invested in helping students and encourage students to write about personal topics, most instructional approaches continue to be driven by "part-to-whole" methods that decontextualize the teaching of writing from their applied contexts in the real world (Grubb et al., 2011). Grubb et al. (2011) argue that even when students are given the chance to write about personal experiences, the part-to-whole nature of writing classroom instruction invariably means that "contexts are confabulated, or made up for the purposes of teaching" (p. 34) and rarely reflect the social and academic contexts that the students themselves find most meaningful or relevant. Students may be able to share personal experiences in their writing but rarely have opportunities to engage in the kind of methodological and analytical work that matters to them.

In other disciplines, researchers have designed new methodologies to expand the notion of what counts as context. These new methods have opened new interpretive possibilities, understandings of how students might construct knowledge, and pedagogical approaches; however, like writing studies, they still restrict their definitions of context to what takes place in the classroom. Teaching and learning are thus restricted to what is immediately observable within formal classroom interactions between students or between students and instructors. With the introduction of video analysis and interactional ethnography in education research, for example, critical opportunities opened up for classroom researchers and instructors to make the social construction of classroom practices visible. When researchers abandoned familiar ways of

163

interpreting and seeing student work (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Green, Skukauskaite & Baker, 2012) and began to define context as a *process* that students engaged in together rather than as a physical location, they challenged prevailing assumptions, biases, and ideologies about students, student interactions, and students' ways of doing and learning (Goldman & McDermott, 2007). The subsequent evolution of education researchers' toolkits of analytical methods and contextually-specific ways of representing student interaction (Castanheira et al., 2001) opened a range of new possibilities for examining contexts of learning and interaction. These included the ability to account for environmental and spatial contexts more accurately (Ciolek & Kendon, 1980), to expose the complexities of classroom interaction, to situate classrooms in larger historical and political contexts (Goldman & McDermott, 2007), and to turn conventional understandings of context from "what is a context?" into "*when* is a context?" (Erickson & Shultz, 1981, emphasis added). These changes have since played a central role in helping education researchers challenge the cultural deficit models and discourses in education. With advances in video footage and interactional ethnographic methodologies, researchers can now document what students are *actually* doing in classrooms, what opportunities are made available to them, and how classroom contexts develop and evolve over time with differential effects on different students. These tools allow researchers to understand the social and contextual realities of classroom learning and interactions, and with their new insights, they can expose the problematic assumptions underlying seemingly neutral teaching practices.

Despite these methodological advances and their role in challenging prevailing cultural and racial deficit models, however, education researchers and interactional ethnographers still tend to tie context to the specific classroom setting or student interaction under observation. This has meant that education researchers who use these methods rarely need to look beyond the scope of what is immediately observable within the learning event in order to build a sense of context. Although classroom ethnographers may use life histories of classrooms, domain

analysis charts, comparative timelines, and structuration maps of activities to construct new ways of thinking about student interactions, these methods still focus on establishing contexts within the boundaries of the immediate classroom. This comes at the expense of examining the many contexts — political, economic, lived, educational, and more — that extend beyond the recorded event or interaction. These overlooked contexts may be far more salient to instructors' understandings of what students are actually doing, who they are, and what forms of knowledge and experience they bring with them than anything happening within observed classroom interaction. As Gutierrez, Larsen, and Kreuter's (1995) research makes clear, if classroom interactions reflect the socialization practices and processes by which students are taught to reproduce the middle-class values, skills, and behaviors that "count," then researchers who focus on classroom interactions as evidence of student learning run the risk of fetishizing the work (or performance) of "studenting" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019) without questioning the limitations of these classroom scripts.

In academic writing classes where successful performance is tied to the demonstrated mastery of learning outcomes and skills, it is critical for instructors to redefine context in order to gain insight into what they may be missing when they only focus on what is immediately observable within the classroom or predetermined by the field's established disciplinary practices. What are the contexts of learning and lived experience that are most relevant for both students and instructors of color as they challenge the racist power structures in academic writing programs? What do these expanded contexts of learning reveal about the complexity of student work that researchers and instructors cannot track through observational and ethnographic research alone? This chapter examines how postsecondary writing instructors define the critical issues and relevant contexts that they find crucial for challenging established disciplinary practices in their field. Taking instructor experiences as the unit of analysis, I examine how two writing instructors have constructed unconventional understandings of what

it means to work with students of color in academic writing classes in order to challenge the disciplinary practices and learning outcomes that guide their home departments' equity and inclusion initiatives. Whereas the equity and inclusion initiatives discussed in the first chapter of this dissertation work within the existing frameworks of institutional excellence and recognizable disciplinary practices, the instructors in this chapter challenge these frameworks by redesigning pedagogical practice when working with students of color on academic writing.

Guided by the complex histories of their own personal and professional journeys in and outside of academia, the writing instructors in this chapter reconceptualize what it means to use writing courses as spaces for engaging in a larger fight for racial and social justice. Their work with students and communities of color both in and outside of the university connects to complex political questions, practices, and principles that envision different relationships between educational and social structures. Instead of focusing on the mastery of skill or learning outcomes in a field that prides itself on helping students acquire and deploy a range of literacy tools for personal advancement, these instructors reject the assumption that individual advancement within the academy reflects evidence of equitable progress. Instead, they draw attention to the great potential academic writing has to become a vehicle for intervening in and transforming the racial and economic inequalities that structure the communities from which their students come and in which they live. Their work shows that if writing instructors prioritized different social contexts and connected their work in the classroom to needs beyond established disciplinary practices and mandated learning objectives, writing classes could contribute to social change more effectively. By framing their work as always attuned to, emerging from, and seeking to address the political, racial, and economic inequities that shape their students' lived experiences, these writing instructors offer alternative ways of looking at what is possible once we situate the teaching of academic writing in contexts that have been consistently overlooked or deemed irrelevant to academic writing. In the process of doing so,

they also expose the complex conditions and histories that shape learning and the production of knowledge in writing classes.

This chapter examines the factors that shape these writing instructors' work with students of color and investigates how they make sense of and resist the many ideological, pedagogical, and administrative restrictions imposed on them by their home departments and the broader composition field. Their stories illustrate the dangers of continuing to implement diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives that work hand in hand with seemingly objective and universally applicable pedagogical and disciplinary practices. Their work speak to the fact that administrative initiatives and their associated research methodologies do not necessarily provide instructors with the most salient contexts they need to understand what students are really doing, who they are, or what they are capable of doing in writing courses. Writing instructors instead need pedagogical models that help them to understand and make use of students' long educational histories and their methods for reconstructing meaning in context. This chapter attempts to underscore how the very people who have some of the deepest insights into the issues that writing program administrators need to pay attention to are silenced in multiple ways. It makes visible how, despite these challenges, writing instructors continue to reimagine the work of writing classes and how they encourage students to build projects and working relationships with each other that prioritize collective needs over individual advancement.

"FA": Higher Education Tutorial Programs as Context

FA's (they/their) work with students of color began well before they started their career as a writing instructor in higher education. While employed as a professional tutor in tutorial programs designed to serve underrepresented students of color, first generation college students, and low-income students in higher education, FA saw the challenges students of color faced in their academic classes and lives. Each week, FA and their colleagues worked with dozens

of students in writing, literature, math, and science tutorials, helping them to break down concepts, processes, and analytical approaches together. As they helped students figure out how to move forward in their work, however, FA and their colleagues noticed that students of color continued to struggle even when students followed the methods recommended by instructors or when tutors used established pedagogical techniques in their tutoring sessions. As they tried to make sense of this disconnect, FA and their colleagues realized that most of the pedagogical and methodological approaches instructors and tutors were expected to use did not reflect how students were actually thinking about and constructing contexts for themselves. Conventional pedagogical approaches and techniques that instructors used to explain course material were designed under the assumption that all students could learn and process using the same logics and methods. These ways of thinking and doing worked well for some students, but overlooked the vast majority of students who came to the tutoring center for help, and particularly students of color and first-generation college students. These methodological approaches were foundational to the disciplines and the disciplinary practices students were expected to master, but routinely ensured that students of color and first-generation students would not succeed or excel in these disciplines. As such, FA and their colleagues began rethinking how they worked with students. FA noticed that students brought with them such complex experiences and ways of thinking about course material that it was ineffective to use the same pedagogies and methodologies for each student. They realized that students far exceeded disciplinary expectations when given the freedom to use their experiences and unconventional ways of constructing knowledge to approach their work. In a deliberate rejection of both disciplinary convention and expectation, FA and their colleagues began developing tutoring approaches that sought to center students' community cultural wealth and their unique ways of building context, understandings, and methods. They wanted students to be able to construct knowledge using the contexts that were important to them, and to address the issues that were of pressing concern to

168

them. Instead of working with students across different subjects using *reactive* tutoring methods that only prepared students to pass a paper or exam, FA and their colleagues' concerted efforts to design new pedagogical approaches based on students' positionality and ways of constructing knowledge meant that they could now work with students *proactively*. They began to work with students to build the kinds of analytical approaches and ways of constructing knowledge that would serve them beyond the constraints of an individual assignment, class, or paper in their academic, personal, and professional lives. They envisioned and designed tutoring methods that would prepare students to work on long-term projects meant to address real, pressing concerns in their lives using methods that were authentic to each student's unique ways of making sense of material.

FA's early tutoring experiences and realizations about student learning were crucial for transforming their understandings of what it meant to work with historically underrepresented student populations in higher education. They brought these insights to their later work as a writing instructor in higher education. FA began working in a writing department at a research university over seven years ago, specifically choosing to start their teaching career at this school because of the student population they would be serving. As a higher education institution with a large student-of-color population, including Latinx, Southeast Asian, and African American students, the university offered FA the opportunity to continue their work with underrepresented students of color who were the first in their family to attend college. Given FA's extensive experience building analytical approaches and methodologies with students across the disciplines, FA made it a point in their role as a writing instructor to continue building the transformative, student-centered pedagogical approaches they had begun developing during their early career in tutoring centers.

The Misrecognition and Misunderstanding of Contexts in University Writing Programs

At the center of the conceptual framework that guides FA's work with students of color is the notion of context and what it means to recognize and understand the contexts that actually matter for students as they learn. According to FA, composition instructors and composition researchers in their home department problematically assume that "relevant contexts" for writing instruction are tied to classroom practices, which include the activities, topics, assigned texts, learning outcomes, and pedagogies used to teach writing and to scaffold the learning process. According to FA, writing instructors tend to teach with the expectation that they must *create* the most relevant contexts for academic writing through curricular design and by carefully sequencing assignments and learning experiences. In this sense, instructors assume that in order to help students build the necessary contexts for writing effective papers, they must identify proactively the readings, exercises, and feedback that will help students reproduce established disciplinary practices, skills, and ways of thinking. FA argues, however, that fixating on curriculum as context is premised on the notion that the instructor is responsible for finding and fixing the "problems" in student writing, which contributes to a deficit paradigm that immediately relegates students to a position of not knowing. This is what FA calls the "false construction of context" within part-to-whole pedagogical approaches, where instructors construct contexts and procedures that may increase instructional efficiency but that in fact disenfranchise students because they fail to reflect the specific contexts that students actually find useful as they work and learn (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). In doing so, writing instructors miss critical opportunities to focus their attention on what FA describes as the process of "*constructing critical contexts through working with people*" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). According to FA, if instructors take the time to engage in collaborative constructions of critical contexts with students, then the classroom has the capacity to become more than a place where students simply "do and learn writing" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). In

these ways, the writing classroom can become a place where students can bring their experiences and, through their conversations with their colleagues and instructors, build the contexts and collective knowledge together that are essential for developing projects that will do critical work in people's lives.

To illustrate their point, FA repeatedly referred to the use of entry surveys that writing instructors commonly give to students at the start of the term. Entry surveys are meant to "build context" for the instructor by asking questions about where students come from, which classes they have taken in prior semesters, their major, their goals in the class, their linguistic history, their level of comfort with academic writing, and more. All questions are designed to provide instructors with the information that will help them situate each student with respect to where they are in their academic trajectories. With this information, instructors can plan their assignments for the remainder of the semester so the curriculum and activities align with or engage with student interests, learning histories, and goals. When structured as introductory letters to the instructor, these surveys can be useful tools instructors can use to learn about their students and their experiences. Entry and midterm surveys or reflective writing activities are now considered staples in classroom instruction and effective mechanisms for establishing rapport between instructors and students (Goldstein, 2005); yet, because of FA's extensive academic background in and experiences working as a social science, writing, and literature tutor, they have difficulty seeing these surveys and the contexts they provide about students in the same ways as their colleagues. They argue that the surveys "give you little useful information — only a timeline, course dedication. This is not reality — those surveys don't personalize the reality of their [students'] experiences at all. They are catch-alls, a pixel of the whole picture that's for the comfort of the instructor to feel like they're doing something but it doesn't help the student. It compiles *statistics*, not *action*. A piece of paper is a piece of paper. A survey is a survey. A survey is designed not to talk to them [the students] — it's designed to compile statistics for the greater

institution. If an instructor believes in the survey, the instructor believes in the greater institution: they get expected results, not what's really happening with students" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019).

FA's concerns with survey-generated contexts stem from their belief that these surveys contribute to the "mechanization" of what counts as context. Within academic and writing history surveys, instructors can assume *well before they interact and work with students* what the most relevant contexts for writing instruction, understanding student backgrounds, and designing lesson plans and curricula will be. Questions commonly asked of students reveal that instructors have already formulated a sense of what they believe is important to the student and what they believe instructors must know about students. According to FA, this means that instructors use surveys to scaffold learning outcomes and course assignments to ensure successful completion in courses that have already been designed instead of using them to build new assignments, pedagogical approaches, and methods from the ground up that reflect students' unique backgrounds. FA pointed out, for instance, that the tendency to ask students which courses they are taking is based on the pretense that asking about students' major and other classes will help instructors "know" the students better so they can teach and engage students more effectively. As FA bluntly pointed out, however, "If students are taking science classes, *will the instructor use science methods and methodologies to teach the class*? No. Why do you need to know a student is taking a science class if you are not going to use these interdisciplinary methods to make sure she's getting the best out of what she's doing now?" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). The issue at stake here for FA is that instructors never use the majority of information students provide in these context-generating surveys to rethink course design and methods. As such, the construction of context via survey more accurately reflects the contexts the instructor presumes or wants to build based on pre-existing assumptions rather than the contexts that the students actually bring and use. In classrooms where instructors have already established a planned

learning trajectory and assumptions about what counts as context, students rarely have

opportunities to bring to their work the experiences, histories, and knowledge that are most

relevant to them as they learn.

FA's analysis reveals how easily educators mistake instructor contexts for student

contexts under the assumption that surveys are effective tools for capturing salient information

that can inform their teaching. FA's experiences working directly with students in tutorials,

however, have taught them that the most important things they need to understand about

students in order to support their learning are not static, reportable pieces of information that

can be captured by asking students for a written response to an entry or exit survey. FA argues

that when instructors attempt to construct context through leading questions, students often fall

back on what they describe as "programmatic responses" — responses that offer what students

believe instructors want to hear rather than revealing what instructors truly need to know about

students' ways of constructing knowledge. According to FA, the most relevant contexts for

understanding how students learn and how they make sense of material are best understood and

constructed through the long process of taking the time to work with students as they would in

a tutorial session. According to FA, it is only through this collaborative process of building

understandings and contexts together over time that instructors can determine with any kind of

accuracy how students bring contexts and knowledge into being. FA describes this distinction as

follows: "'Do I know their [student] context?' is a fake question. The real question is 'What am I

going to do to try to learn about their experiences and what they are doing with me, with us?'

Either you are working with the students or you are not. The context of what they're actually

doing and working with [in and outside of the classroom] is important to see, not just the

assignment they are working on" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). What FA highlights

here are the processes by which instructors must come to situated understandings of students

through sustained interactions with them and through the collective construction of knowledge.

173

Traditional hierarchies between instructor and student are not necessarily dismantled through the kinds of interactions FA describes; yet, through the process of working with students as they make sense of course material, instructors can begin to build more accurate contexts of understanding based on what they and students are doing, experiencing, building, and learning together as they work together.

In this sense, contexts are not determined by what the instructor *wants* or *assumes* is the context, but are instead determined by how their organic interactions allow them to build the most relevant contexts for the work they are doing together. As FA puts it, "context is *what becomes relevant context to participants in their interaction*" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). This process of context coming into being is fundamentally at odds with the static notions of context that one typically finds in education research, including descriptions of classroom setup, lesson plan outlines, descriptions of activities, and universal academic trajectories. According to FA, instructors can only discover relevant contexts of learning when they sit together with students, work with them, and make sense of things with them. Only then can instructors begin to understand what students are really doing, *how* they are working together, *why* they are working together in these ways, and how their ways of building knowledge organically reveal the most salient contexts and pieces of information they use to learn.

For FA, these reformulations of context can play tremendous roles in students of color's work in university writing classes, but they depend on moving away from the conventional formulations of writing assignments and disciplinary practices that typically structure writing courses. Students must have the space to build the contexts that are not only relevant for the projects they want to work on, but that also allow them to connect their work to their lived experiences authentically. FA argues that students have and bring more complex real life experiences to their work than are currently elicited through instructors' assignments. They maintain that, because of their complexity, these real experiences have the capacity to challenge

174

the fixity and narrowness of what typically counts as context in generic, goal-oriented writing topics and genres. To illustrate their point, FA uses the example of a common writing assignment for multilingual students in composition classes where they are asked to write about their homes and discuss their home languages. The personal narrative genre allows students to bring their personal lives and experiences into the composition class, but FA points out that this task commonly becomes an exercise in what they call "narratizing for literature" or "turning a narrative into narrative for the classroom" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). They argue that this approach forces students to build context and narratives about their home lives and languages to demonstrate mastery over grammatical skills they have acquired in the class, but does not necessarily give students the space or tools to *use* their home languages to construct new forms of analysis or to reveal the complex realities of their lives and communities.

To FA, the real mission of writing classes must change: rather than serving as spaces where students *write about* and *report on* to produce an academic product that showcases their mastery over mechanical skills, writing classes should give students the freedom to *design, build, and investigate* so they can work towards creating material change in their communities. When instructors tie writing tasks to specific genres such as rhetorical analysis or personal narrative, students are expected to follow specific processes and are assessed by criteria that limit their scope of inquiry, making it difficult for them to design projects that move in unanticipatable and unexpected directions. For FA, leveraging personal experience for the reproduction of disciplinary convention and genre is a pedagogical and ethical failure that controls for context out of instructional and disciplinary convenience. In these situations where a specific process, end product, and evaluation criteria have been laid out in advance, students of color have little space to design their own processes or build their own contexts. Investigation in most writing classes thus begins with the starting premise of "I want to argue," "I want to show," or "this is the purpose of my paper" rather than "let's figure something out" (FA, Participant Interview,

175

June 13, 2019). As students learn to apply standard argumentation methods to their personal narratives and begin to compile evidence to "prove their thesis" or to demonstrate a preconceived point that answers an already restrictive prompt, writing becomes an exercise in being able to prove what the student already knows or to demonstrate that they know how to fit their experience to the instructor's expectations and grading rubric. FA maintains that when students do not have the space to experience writing as a process of organic investigation and discovery that leads to unexpected understandings, they lose critical opportunities to experience writing as a dynamic and transformative process that they can use to develop new ideas and to create change. FA argues that this control over what counts as context and process disproportionately impacts students of color, as students of color do not have opportunities to design and build their own work or to experience writing as a process of discovery until they work on senior thesis projects during their final year of college. For the majority of their time in college, they are forced to follow instructors' orchestrated procedures and assignments despite having their own ideas, ways of constructing knowledge, and ways of making sense of issues that challenge conventional expectations.

FA's work in the classroom thus starts with the premise that students *are* the context. As students begin building their own processes and ways of formulating and situating their work, instructors must not only work to understand how students are building understandings and what becomes relevant to them as students design their own contexts and methods, but instructors must also begin to build contexts and resources *with and alongside* their students based on their growing understanding of what the students are constructing together. In this sense, FA sees the role of the writing instructor shifting from that of an expert who controls both topic, context, and the production of context to that of an informant — "someone who will help them [students] make a project … someone with whom they can work and have the confidence to work and help produce something specific to what they want and how they want to put it

together" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). As instructors move away from orchestrating the writing process and towards centering students and students' unique approaches to inquiry, FA argues that these new formulations change the classroom dynamic in critical ways, making it impossible for instructors or students to rely on established procedures or conventions in the discipline. As students begin building context and redefining what is possible in their writing projects, they open spaces for their classmates to begin tackling similarly complex issues that exceed the restrictions of typical assignments in composition classes. This forces instructors to develop new methods for working with and alongside students who are constructing, building, and designing in ways that often surpass conventional disciplinary expectations and the expertise of the instructor. FA argues that this practice of having students "making and doing their own models" rather than "making existing models and activities their own" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019) better serves students of color, as it gives them the latitude to explore and begin formulating their own ways of constructing knowledge and designing new methods. As students design new methods and construct novel ways of conceptualizing what they consider to be the most relevant contexts with which to understand social issues, they introduce perspectives and forms of inquiry that are often overlooked by traditional academic writing genres and disciplinary frameworks.

FA argues that it is impossible to measure or define success in these situations using the standardized criteria and rubrics that most writing classes follow. If students are rethinking contexts and reformulating methods to reflect the conditions they are studying, the instructor must move away from traditional forms of advising and assessment so they, too, can be similarly responsive and accountable to what students are actually doing and discovering in real social situations. As students construct new ways of thinking and doing that are premised on social accountability, instructors must also construct new ways of working with students to figure out alongside them and to discover how best to support their work. In our conversations, FA

177

pointed to the work of two students of color developing a science paper for FA's writing class as an example of what is possible when students have the space to construct their own contexts. In this situation, FA was forced to figure out how their students were building contexts and understandings in order to assist them. They described the process of having to re-learn gene therapy and stem cell research in order to understand how students were making sense of the critical issues the students felt were important to understand. They sat with the students in class and in office hours, spending hours that term doing research with the students and analyzing articles with them. They developed questions together, talked through different ways of analyzing the issues, and approached inquiry in different ways. Over the course of several weeks, FA had to learn the material on their own and follow the students' lead in order to figure out how to advise them as they were building. They noted that this latter experience was critical: by following the students' lead, FA learned the distinction between having students *read about information* as the instructor would impart knowledge, versus having students *"do their own constructions"* for projects while the instructor would *do the work of learning and figuring out "what contexts students are trying to construct and how they are working with their instructor to build those contexts"* (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019, emphasis added). Their experiences reveal that the real work of writing courses is not necessarily to "give students something to *do*" — the approach when instructors have students read and write *about* topics from a safe distance — but instead to recognize students' capacity to *design and contribute* original analysis and methods for addressing what they see as urgent social issues (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019).

The Weaknesses of Academic Writing Programs and the Struggle for Learning

FA has become increasingly interested in working with students as they construct their own contexts of learning because they recognize that many writing instructors often fail to see the relevance of students' authentic processes for making sense of information and building

178

understandings in highly structured writing classes. FA disagrees with the pervasive assumption in writing classes that students who cannot meet the standard learning outcomes or master grammar concepts are incapable of succeeding in their courses. These logics subscribe to a deficit model of education that FA believes is disrespectful to students of color whose ongoing efforts to build original analysis precede their entry into university composition courses but which writing programs regularly ignore. The skills students come into their classes with are often deemed only marginally relevant in courses where standardized learning outcomes and skills-based instruction presumably open more or better opportunities for students in the academy and beyond. FA describes the presumed openness of academic writing classes and what they call the "language of opportunity" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019) within most entry-level writing courses as an ongoing move by the field and departments to draw attention away from the fact that students of color are only partially included in these opportunities. Writing courses offer students a space to learn the analytical, research, and communication skills that are expected of them in the academy and which will serve them well once they leave academia. Yet, FA argues that these same opportunities in writing classes often simultaneously prevent students from bringing the more complex aspects of themselves and their experiences into the classroom. The ethnic student organizations on FA's campus, for instance, are student-created spaces that FA's students formed because they needed a support system that was unavailable in their classes or anywhere else on campus. They described these organizational spaces to FA as a "home base" where they could begin working on projects together that were relevant to their communities and reflective of their interest in racial justice — projects that were impossible to work on in their classes. As FA argues, the political climate within writing courses and on campus more generally is such that students "can *only* create these kinds of [organizing] spaces outside of class" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019), as writing

179

program instructors do not necessarily see how these projects align with program learning outcomes or skill- and form-based work.

The difficulties that FA's students have faced in bringing their projects into their writing classes are reminiscent of the history that Haivan Hoang (2015) details about the historical and ongoing difficulties Asian American student activists have had in seeing their writing classes as viable spaces where they can write for political and social action. Asian American student activists used writing to articulate their racialized subject positions and to advance their struggles against racial oppression alongside other students of color in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Their struggles to democratize the university led composition programs to begin teaching and conceptualizing writing with more attention to diversity and social issues; yet, Hoang (2015) reminds us that even with these changes, students of color still found themselves having to build spaces outside of traditional writing classrooms where they could organize, speak, and write against racial injustices to affect material change in their communities. Students' turn to literary and cultural production outside of the academy and university writing courses thus had distinctly different goals from the kind of literacy and grammatical mastery expected of them in their writing courses. The point of self-sponsored publication and community-based literacy efforts such as Asian American students' forays into writing for social and political movements located writing as a vital source of social action — what Hoang (2015) describes as "a vehicle for cultivating racial and political awareness" (p. 74) capable of driving social and material change for their communities. However, the introduction of multicultural literature and reflective narratives into academic writing programs and English departments in response student demands for a relevant education was instead premised on the notion that *individual* transformation was the key to social change.

Just as the Asian American students discussed in Hoang's work had to carve out spaces for themselves outside the formal boundaries of writing courses to engage in what Ruggles Gere

(1994) calls the extracurriculum of writing education, the students FA works with have similarly found that they must create their own spaces outside of writing courses in order to have the freedom to design their own work without the restrictions of formal class structures. The kinds of writing and projects they find critical for addressing the pressing political, economic, social, and medical issues in their communities require space and resources that their writing classes do not provide. To FA, this is a significant oversight — one that is symptomatic of academic writing programs' and composition research's failure to make themselves relevant to students of color. Students of color do not necessarily see the skills they are required to learn in these classes as immediately relevant to the problems their communities face. FA maintains that writing programs' insistence on adhering to the disciplinary practices, skills, and contexts that structure the field undermines instructors' ability to understand what students of color are actually doing and saying. By controlling for objectives rather than trying to understand what students want to do with their writing, university writing programs adopt pedagogical approaches and assignments that, according to FA, undermine their own potential as academic units. Academic writing departments insist on teaching students how to write pre-structured essays that in fact have little to do with the kind of research and work being done in other disciplines and especially in upper-division courses and research labs. This has unintentionally contributed to their perceived irrelevance both to students and to the larger research mission of universities. FA explains that, "Because we [writing departments] do essays, we are disprized by the rest of the academy as deficit. Students need to learn to write, but the writing [that they learn in writing departments] is not relevant. We live in an environment where [writing] faculty create their own hell and disjunction by propagating the belief in developmental English in a university that doesn't have developmental English. We're supposed to be doing *academic* writing and reading and writing composition. We're supposed to be already presuming they [students] are at the

university. But we give them coursework that is at the developmental English level" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019).

FA's analysis makes visible the weaknesses of writing programs: writing programs work to help students to write with clarity and structure as they communicate their ideas, but the push to clarify and structure according to highly orchestrated and conventional forms can artificially restrict the parameters of students' work and undermine their true capabilities. When working within the constraints of compare/contrast essays and learning how to formulate 3-part thesis statements, students have few opportunities to learn how to write in order to *design* and *reenvision*. According to FA, students instead must follow mechanized learning procedures reminiscent of the kind of work commonly expected of students in so-called developmental or remedial English courses. As a result, writing programs find themselves in the problematic position of being perceived as essential because they provide basic skills training that helps other departments that do not have to do this work, but they are simultaneously marginalized because other departments never consider their work to be innovative or capable of contributing to crucial advances in research or social transformation.

Although writing programs teach students what FA describes as "content performance" — how to write clearly *about* texts and how to offer rhetorical analysis *about* political situations within the constraints of tightly controlled genres — they do not necessarily give students the space to embark on the kind of problem-solving and context-building analytical work that is expected of them in their upper-division research courses or outside of the academy. FA believes this oversight has not only damaged the field by contributing to its perceived irrelevance, but has also disenfranchised students of color whose ideas and whose innovative use of writing in their extracurricular activities are routinely overlooked by their writing instructors. Because FA has seen what is possible when students of color have the space to build their own writing projects that are relevant to their lives and that address issues where there is something

182

important at stake, FA has committed to making their writing classroom a space where students can engage in the so-called "extracurriculum" of writing education (Ruggles Gere, 1994). This is what FA sees as the central, real work of writing classes. If students see writing as a way to build and design relevant contexts and understandings, to formulate new visions of what is possible, and to transform these ideas into social action and material change, then writing courses can, according to FA, become spaces that actually contribute to social transformation instead of reinforcing deficit and developmental ideologies. FA calls this the "struggle for learning" — the process of problem-solving together and creating projects that are not only meaningful to students, but that emerge from students' ongoing fight to be able to design and build the contexts of understanding and projects that are important for them and their communities (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019).

Dismantling the Rhetorics Through Interdisciplinary Methodological Design

The field's fixation on and reification of rhetorical appeals and devices has become a significant challenge in FA's ongoing efforts to build writing classes that allow students to construct knowledge and contexts of understanding. FA sees the rhetorics as a textbook example of the kinds of structure/function models and controlled genres that they believe suppress students' ways of building innovative understandings and processes. The rhetorics offer students ways to think about issues of audience and persuasion with clear forms and structures that can be easily used to build and analyze arguments. Students can, for instance, use the three rhetorical pillars — logos, ethos, and pathos — as foundational definitions with which to assess any piece of work and to create persuasive arguments to shape their readers' responses through logic, authority, and emotion. Teaching students to study and reproduce rhetorical appeals and forms of argumentation, however, is designed to push students to master skills, form, and content at the expense of helping students learn how to build their own processes

183

and understandings. According to FA, the rhetorics "have a built-in structure — logos, ethos, pathos — which is a *fill-in procedure* 'matching' the definition [of the different rhetorical forms] with its implementation in the text" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). As such, FA argues that "writing becomes a re-mapping of interpretation and what you got out of the reading — it is reporting on *structure* like thesis, framework, topic sentence, and evidence rather than building a sense of how things fit together through experience or building contexts as you build understandings" (FA, Participant Interview, June 18, 2019 and June 20, 2019). The source of FA's concern comes from the rhetorics' focus on structure. Because rhetorical appeals and rhetorical forms of argumentation teach students how arguments are built through language and form, students are trained to *look for and reproduce* heavily structured organizational forms, logics, and patterns that may have little to do with the real issues or perspectives that they should be looking at.

To assess how writers create ethos, for example, students are taught to look for the evidence writers use to prove their arguments, which lead students to fixate on the *type* of evidence used (e.g., quantitative or qualitative; reliable source or unreliable source) and the extent to which this evidence "matches" or proves the argument (e.g., topic sentence or thesis). To FA, however, this simply reinscribes the dominant logics of the organizational forms that students are already familiar with. It reinforces the notion that students should always be looking for and reproducing what "counts" as effective organization, analysis, and form. This, according to FA, is dangerous on a number of levels. The different rhetorical forms and approaches students learn to pay attention to and use in their work offer a clear method for writing a paper and tackling a text with an accessible analytical framework: students can look for examples of how writers build ethos throughout their writing, which gives them a clear process for analyzing the effectiveness of this rhetorical strategy while modeling how to build this ethos in their own work. Yet, these templates and lists of criteria ultimately end up becoming assessment tools that

can be used to penalize students if they fail to adhere to the guidelines. Students may, for instance, demonstrate *analytically* that they understand how to identify the methods a writer uses to build their authority structurally and linguistically within an article; however, if the same students subsequently fail to use and apply the same organizational forms and methods for building their own ethos as writers, their work presumably falls short of the grading criteria. In effect, the very mechanisms students can use to identify logos or ethos in texts can, in turn, be used to judge their ability to follow the exact procedures and criteria for reproducing these structures in their own work and analysis.

The real danger FA sees for students, however, is how the rhetorics train students to focus on what amounts to passing issues of form, language, and structure at the expense of taking the time to discover and understand the real issues they should be researching and building deep understandings of. FA finds the rhetorical fixation on form and structure to be deeply problematic because students in their class often discuss texts and write papers about serious issues where rhetorical form and structure have little to do with the real issues at hand. Students in the medical sciences who dutifully attempt to "transfer" the rhetorical analysis skills they have learned in their writing courses and apply them to discussions of medical science papers end up "making typical, detached comments in the classroom based on what they read" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). FA adamantly challenges these practices because they facilitate students' failure to understand and their inability to engage critically with the complex and technical problems that these articles and researchers are grappling with. Rhetorical analysis offers students one way to engage with and write about texts, but in many situations, and particularly in STEM and the social sciences, it fails to help students construct the kinds of contexts and ways of making sense of issues that they need to create real change in social systems and in people's lives. FA describes the need for writing instructors to show students "what is really happening in the field, not how it is talked about in classroom activity,"

185

which requires deconstructing the assumption that rhetorical academic writing classroom activities are the same as helping students design methods, procedures, and processes that will help them contribute to fields in meaningful ways (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019).

FA thus insists on drawing a clear distinction between having students engage in activities that are proxies for controlled curriculum design and having students engage in their own constructions of innovative methods, contexts, and processes. This exposes the disconnect between what students are trained to believe and gives them the space to "figure out what they *should* believe and understand" in order to solve real problems (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). To this end, FA disagrees with their colleagues who maintain that students of color should first learn and master rhetorical strategies so they can then reappropriate the tools that historically have been used to disenfranchise communities of color. FA argues instead that the tendency to focus on "'use for survival,' 'know how it works for survival,' and 'know it so you can appropriate it for different purposes' takes away valuable opportunities for students to construct new methods that are unique to them" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). FA argues that new methods unique to each student will serve students far more effectively in the long-run than the currently available tools.

According to FA, instructors need to begin focusing more on the process of building interdisciplinary methods in academic writing classrooms in order to help students of color move beyond the restrictions of the rhetorics. More specifically, FA argues that students must become familiar with interdisciplinary methods and build their own so they can identify what they actually need to know in order to drive social change. To illustrate this point, FA repeatedly discussed examples in our discussions illustrating how interdisciplinary methods quickly reveal the flawed premises of research designed according to the rhetorics and academic writing conventions. According to them, research questions, which writing instructors commonly introduce to students as they write research papers, are premised on the assumption that

186

students need a focused question or sets of questions in order to figure out what they want to research and to guide their investigation. In addition to delineating the scope of inquiry, research questions also offer a way for students to focus their inquiry, to introduce the reader to the questions motivating their study, and to offer an organizational structure for a paper. FA points out, however, that this practice only works for certain types of papers. If we look at the work being done in other disciplines, the concept of a research question as taught within the rhetorical school does students an injustice by artificially constraining the scope and form of inquiry early in the research process in ways that are not always useful. FA describes the research process as follows: "The research question for a paper is 'I'll show you the constraints so you can formulate your research question.' But you don't do a research question for some fields. You do 'what's the figure rate?' You do what's called general questions or specific questions. There are different ways to ask questions, and there are different levels of questioning. [Writing programs] just presume the research question is there because everyone does research papers. There are different ways of doing research papers. They aren't teaching methodology [with research questions] — they're teaching structure-function and rote methods. You've got this structure, do this function. You're teaching rote methods …" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). In fixating on "research question," writing instructors often fail to recognize that the issues students are writing about are "actual experiences in lived contexts" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019) — experiences that require *situated* investigation and inquiry to analyze the issues in their complexity, rather than rote forms and structures.

Other disciplines often dismiss both the structured research questions that students learn to construct in writing courses and the formulaic rhetorical structures they are taught to use, because these methods discourage students from questioning underlying assumptions and from investigating the contexts needed to analyze the issues at hand. According to FA, writing instructors consistently fail to distinguish the difference between a decontextualized rhetorical

exercise and analysis that seeks to understand people's lived experiences. Just as instructors miss the point that "pathos is not a *mental* exercise, but 'what is *your* suffering *now*?'" they similarly overlook how encouraging students to master exercises in research questions or the rhetorics can prevent students from exploring salient questions and from using new forms of analysis to situate their projects in lived contexts and realities (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). Rather than forcing students to develop research questions that reproduce formulaic procedures, FA tries to help students construct the kinds of questions that *open* possibility and build new ways of knowing and thinking through direct engagement with people's lived experiences. Ruth Wilson Gilmore (2008) describes the "stretch, resonance, and resilience" (p. 37-38) of questions that force researchers to confront the limitations of closed questioning and to recalibrate based on changing contexts, evolving understandings, and dynamic engagement with others. The stretch, resonance, and resilience of questions encourage and push us to think about issues, respond to the unexpected, and engage with others in new and unanticipated ways (Gilmore, 2008). Other disciplines and fields are already doing the work of helping students build research projects that situate their research in experiential realities and the understandings that come from engaging in preliminary field work. For FA, it is thus critical that students become familiar with interdisciplinary methods and approaches so they can apply and design their own interdisciplinary methods and questions with stretch, resonance, and resilience. Methods and questions that account for real complexities and that recognize that real issues are at stake will help students recognize the importance of responding to dynamic contexts with new logics and different ways of co-constructing knowledge.

To FA, the common practice of teaching students how to develop closed research questions and encouraging them to apply rhetorical and text-based analytical methods are symptomatic of academic writing's isolation and disconnection from the practical and methodological work researchers are conducting in other fields. FA maintains that the premise

of having writing instructors design research question activities and carefully scaffolded research assignments that prioritize text-based analysis makes little sense. Many science and social science fields do not regard writing program research projects highly because they are not directly relevant to the research being done in these fields and often fail to address the real work that needs to be done. FA described an example of students writing a final research paper about prosthetics for an upper division writing course as just one example of how writing instruction steeped in the rhetorics may offer extensive text-based insights into the topic, but which inadvertently produces research that does little to change people's lives in the ways that matter to the key stakeholders. Students interested in prosthetics used their science backgrounds and the research skills acquired in their lower- and upper-division writing classes to build a research paper around the redesign of prosthetics. Their interdisciplinary work spanned both the physical and medical sciences and was well-received within the composition department because of its apparent sophistication and clear presentation of a focused research question. The students offered what seemed to be relevant historical context, technical explanations and examples, and original insights into a clearly defined research topic. To FA, however, such an assignment and written product did not address key issues in the sciences, as the assignment allowed students to discuss and write about prosthetics "without ever accounting for the people and their specific experiences …" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). They explained that practitioners who have worked with people directly in the medical field bring very different insights when they research how to design and improve prosthetics compared to those who are "just doing the construction" of a prosthetic or who focus exclusively on researching the history and evolution of prosthetics design in order to propose new models. They stated, "publications that are good for … writing classes are exercises to give them [students] experience, but 'design-in-class' is not meant to really build prosthetics … Most classes will have you design something that 90% of patients will not be able to use. Design in a classroom or a lab space is not understanding how

189

patients experience things. What is the injury? Was there an infection? This is not a matter of *reading* — it's a matter of *working with people directly* for … hours in the field" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019).

In this example, the weaknesses of rhetoric-based research projects and assignments are clear: when students learn to fixate on text-bound content delivery and assume that reading offers the best insights into the most salient contexts for their work, they not only lose sight of people's experiences but also overlook the importance of collectively building understandings of contexts through time spent working with people directly. To design prosthetics that patients will actually use, researchers must work directly with the patients over time to build situated understandings of their lived experiences, their injuries, and the particularities of their bodies and situations. As FA puts it, "*patients make the work real because they tell you what to document and what you're doing wrong*" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). In this example, students who are taught to apply rhetorical methods and who produce text-bound research will "never get close to the realities of patient experiences unless they are working directly in the medical field" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). While rhetorical analysis may allow students to collect and document important information, provide historical context, and apply specific rhetorical forms and guided research approaches, this does not replace the important work of engaging with the people who live these realities on a daily basis. They can explain what to document and what the student researchers might be overlooking or doing incorrectly, and in doing so, they push the student to recognize both the limitations of rhetorical research and the implications if they fail to rethink their methodologies.

To FA, writing courses often do students a fundamental disservice when they do not introduce students to the real work that researchers and practitioners are doing across disciplines or when they assume that the rhetorics can be applied universally across all contexts and fields. This oversight keeps research and ideas about what it means to write about research in the realm

of *text* at the expense of allowing students to build more complex understandings of issues through direct engagement with people and communities. Charles Hale (2008) describes the process of redefining what counts as relevant research and being accountable to local stakeholders and experts in the field as "reclaiming methodological rigor" (p. 8). When their work is assessed by those who live the realities the researcher is writing about, activist researchers are held to more demanding standards and tests of validity than when they use academic conventions and standard disciplinary practices to assess their work. Davydd J. Greenwood (2008) notes that action research, when conceptualized and carried out in collaboration with local stakeholders, is meaningful only to the extent that the theoretical, methodological, and ideological premises of the research are "negotiated openly among the participants" (p 331). When local stakeholders have the authority to assess, interpret, and redefine the scope and trajectory of the research, they ensure it reflects and addresses their needs and realities. In this sense, the stakes of knowledge production, methodological design, and interventions are high, as the consequences of failing to design methodologies and conceptual frameworks that accurately reflect the problems and realities the stakeholders experience put the very people at risk whom the researcher is trying to help. FA recognizes that writing classes contribute to putting people in harm's way when they teach students to assume that the rhetorics are universally beneficial and widely applicable across any problem or context.

As a result, FA has stopped teaching the rhetorics in their writing classes and instead focuses on helping students to learn to *construct* their own interdisciplinary methods and contexts. To FA, context-specific methodological designs that are interdisciplinary and situated in lived realities open critical opportunities for students to intervene in complex social issues about race and racial subordination that cannot be addressed with a single method or ideological approach. The unique circumstances, contexts, and people with which and with whom students work force them to design unique methods that emerge from and respond to these specific contexts. To be

clear, FA's interest in helping students construct interdisciplinary methods must be distinguished from the simple reapplication of, additive combination of, or reproduction of methods across multiple disciplines. FA cautions against the temptation simply to reproduce and reapply traditional methods from other disciplines within new contexts, as this work is "premised on using existing methods *already known to their [students'] home disciplines*" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). FA argues that this approach overlooks the long history of the central role that established disciplinary practices and methodologies have played in reproducing inequities along racial and economic lines as they reinforce dominant ideologies and control the boundaries of what "counts" as legitimate knowledge and who can construct knowledge.

The essays in *Seeing Race Again: Countering Colorblindness across the Disciplines* (Crenshaw, Harris, HoSang & Lipsitz, 2019) best illustrate these problems by documenting how research methodologies and established disciplinary frameworks have structured and facilitated the academy's ongoing refusal to acknowledge or change the racist logics and foundations of academic disciplines. Most academic disciplines are founded on and still deeply invested in the creation and maintenance of racial hierarchies. The contributors to this volume illustrate that the teaching and research methods used in these disciplines have done little to transform these realities or to open opportunities for researchers, scholars, and the public to understand how these racial projects came to be and how they continue to structure disciplinary practices and logics. Instead, these seemingly neutral and objective disciplinary practices make it possible for researchers and students alike to avoid discussing the social, economic, and political conditions that lead to racial inequities and racial subordination. These practices contribute to the colorblind logics that allow academic disciplines to continue operating without ever having to acknowledge or confront the white supremacist and racist dimensions of the methodological approaches, ideological frameworks, and pedagogies that structure their work. The contributors to *Seeing Race Again* make clear that the refusal to interrogate the real conditions and systems that

reproduce inequities are not just ideological but also methodological and pedagogical issues. These practices not only obscure the contexts and mechanisms by which these racial power structures operate, but also suppress the crucial discussions that we need to have to figure out how to transform these systems.

While many scholars continue to use methodologies and disciplinary practices that reproduce colorblind logics and racial hierarchies, Crenshaw, Harris, HoSang, and Lipsitz (2019) argue that the disciplines "also offer discursive tools and analytic moves that, properly contextualized, enable and enhance the telling of race and the reimagination of racial justice" (p. 1). The tools and conventions of academic fields, in other words, may be used to reinforce dominant ideologies and to restrict what counts as knowledge, but are not inherently problematic. When scholars "subvert, redeploy, and marshal the particular insights of disciplinary formations to address the structural dimensions of racial domination" (p. xiv), they can reshape their disciplines by building theories, pedagogies, methodologies, and visions that center race and racial analysis. This can, in turn, inspire new possibilities and directions for the research and work in their respective disciplines. These ways of reconceptualizing and repurposing disciplinary tools and methods to analyze and interrogate racial hierarchies and racial subordination are in part what FA believes are central to the project of transforming the colorblind logics of academic writing programs. FA argues, however, that reimagining disciplinary methods must be an interdisciplinary process in order to break down the siloing of disciplines — something they believe contributes to the ongoing maintenance of inequitable academic systems. They argue that when instructors reimagine disciplinary methods as the *interdisciplinary construction* of new knowledge and methodologies, student experiences and students' novel methodological designs can drive the interdisciplinary reformulations and reenvisionings of conventional writing program practices.

193

To illustrate this, FA described an example of students of color in their writing course with backgrounds in music and math who worked together on their writing projects. Their collaborative work revealed to FA that expecting students to work within the familiar parameters of the rhetorical school would quickly limit the scope of their work. FA recognized that these students came to their writing projects with rich, interdisciplinary methodological backgrounds that had been consistently ignored by their previous writing instructors and which students thus believed were irrelevant to their courses. FA saw, however, that students could not help but use these interdisciplinary ways of making sense of material in their discussions with each other. They describe how these students were in fact "talking with each other and reconstructing knowledge and using methods they know that are personal to them" (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). While students with math backgrounds were using math to explain concepts that would not traditionally "count" as math-based research, "*music students were using music concepts for actually solving things*" even if they were trying to solve issues that were not technically "music" issues (FA, Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). Together, the students were building interdisciplinary ways of making sense of issues and co-constructing relevant contexts and methods.

While the students' use of music and math methods to make sense of their work was far from consistent with the traditional learning outcomes and practices common to writing courses, FA recognized that what they were doing was more important than what their prior writing instructors had taught them to do: by "actually building a method and constructing context together" through the process of using their math and music backgrounds, students were, according to FA, better equipped to construct complex understandings of the texts and concepts at hand (FA Participant Interview, June 13, 2019). Their jointly constructed methods gave them the tools to come to new insights that far surpassed what they could have discovered with the prescriptive logics and procedures of the rhetorics. By using their own methodological

194

and disciplinary expertise and by finding ways to co-construct novel math/music methods, the students positioned themselves to look at the social, economic, and racial issues they were working on from new analytical perspectives while also modeling how to reimagine interdisciplinary methodologies. The students brought conventional disciplinary practices and knowledge to their research, but FA notes that when they considered what students were actually *doing with* these methods to make sense of issues, they saw that students were using their *experiences* of doing math, playing instruments, and thinking through music passages and math problems to build new approaches (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019).

For FA, then, the crucial point is that students were not mechanically reapplying or reproducing established disciplinary practices in a new writing-based context. Instead, they used their experiential knowledge of doing work in these disciplines to reconceptualize and redeploy these methods, thus moving away from established applications. FA argues that because students used their lived experiences as the basis of their assessments and analysis — in this case, for instance, "figuring out how music is constructed and experienced in the physical body" in order to build understandings and analysis together — it was possible for these students to "get rid of the rhetorics" immediately and to build interdisciplinary methods based on real conditions rather than on abstract and overdetermined academic practices (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). FA identified this as a deeply important student-based practice that most writing instructors overlook at great cost to their ability to understand how students of color actually learn. As FA puts it, when students use their experiences of music or math to co-construct the contexts they need to analyze, to build understandings, and to make sense of issues with others, they are building new methods for learning: if instructors fail to pay attention to "*what* they [students] create *in order to learn new things*" and instead fixate on how well students are meeting generic performance indicators, they will overlook how students are *already* constructing their own processes and methods that far surpass the limits of disciplinary practices and

195

methodologies (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). Students of color are always using their experiential understandings to build their own processes for learning and to reconceptualize disciplinary practices. Their ongoing efforts to find new ways to learn material and to construct relevant contexts in the real world are, to FA, crucial for transforming the racial inequities within the writing classroom and composition studies. Students of color are already *but have not yet been recognized* as the inventors of novel research methods and pedagogies capable of challenging disciplinary logics and routines. Students have never been the passive recipients of the disciplinary norms that deliberately obscure oppressive conditions and contexts, but instructors must recognize that students' ongoing efforts to interrogate established practices and to create their own interdisciplinary tools have the potential to challenge the racial power hierarchies that persist in writing programs.

The Ongoing Challenges of Sustaining Transformative, Interdisciplinary Pedagogies and Methodologies in a Product-Driven Program

FA has restructured their writing courses over the years to give students of color the space to build and design their own innovative methods. They believe that when instructors support students' efforts to "create *in order to learn new things*" (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019), students are better positioned to solve complex issues that are of pressing concern to their communities. By helping students see how their own experiences and situated forms of analysis are highly relevant to the construction of new analytical and methodological frameworks and practices, students can contribute in meaningful ways to social change. Yet, FA has acknowledged the increasing difficulty of convincing the students themselves that these approaches to teaching, learning, and writing are useful for their academic work and for their long-term personal and professional goals. As high schools and entry-level university writing programs increasingly adopt rhetorical and "structure-function" methods (FA, Participant

Interview, June 13, 2019) for teaching, students increasingly enter FA's lower- and upper-division writing courses with the expectation that they will learn the same kinds of template-based forms of writing that they were expected to follow in their prior composition courses. Students are confused when they discover that conventional ways of thinking about the organization, function, and form of their essays are inadequate for what FA expects them do and build in their class.

In the initial weeks of the course, FA's students are often resistant to and critical of FA's unconventional methods and pedagogical approaches. FA describes the types of questions students ask and the work they submit at the start of the term as reflective of the steep learning curve they face when designing constructive methods in a writing course for the first time. Students express frustration that they cannot use the rhetorical methods that, by this point, they may have spent up to seven or more years learning about and using in their writing classes. Students commonly question and criticize FA for the difficulty of what they see as the abstract and unstructured task of having to figure out what articles are *doing* rather than simply reporting on their structure by finding the thesis or picking relevant quotes. They similarly question the value of having to construct their own situated contexts of understanding and analysis: why build and design new methods when templates already exist for the rhetorics? Reluctant to abandon the templates and forms they used in their prior courses and unable to see at this point in their education that the long-term benefits of engaging in constructive, interdisciplinary practices far outweigh the immediate convenience of replicating formalist methods, the students in FA's courses consistently raise concerns that FA's class is not run like a typical writing class. The readings, which are scaled to approximate the kinds of texts that students are required to read in other classes and disciplines, are technical and thus require that students draw on their disciplinary knowledge and coursework to make sense of the content. FA does not permit rhetorical approaches to analysis, nor do they subscribe to the notion that writing is an individual

197

task, so students must invest the time and energy into working with their classmates and talking with stakeholders to design projects and interdisciplinary methods that address issues with real consequences for working class communities of color. In short, the course is unlike any writing class students have ever taken. The disconnect between what they have been taught to believe writing classes should be and how FA's class pushes them to think and work differently often leads students to push back against these methods for weeks, and sometimes for the entire semester. However, FA notes that after their initial uncertainties, the majority of students begin to appreciate this approach and start to experiment as they build their own methods and analysis.

Many of FA's students eventually come to understand why FA directly challenges the rhetorical training they received in their prior writing classes. Many students tell FA after completing the class that they continue to use the methods and conceptual frameworks they designed in the class as the basis for their work in other courses and research projects. Yet, as the rhetorics and structure-function models of teaching writing increasingly come to dominate lower-division writing courses and drive corresponding student resistance to FA's pedagogical approaches, FA has had to consider how to create more structured approaches to teaching in order to engage students and address their frustrations. Abandoning this work altogether is not an option for FA: their extensive work in tutorials with students of color and low-income students has shown them that proactively teaching students how to design methods to problem-solve and build analytical contexts far outweigh the short-term benefits of using rhetorical forms and logics. Students of color who have the opportunity to design and analyze in these ways are positioned not only to excel in their future work, but also to see the importance of using writing as a process and tool with which to investigate and develop interventions for urgent problems in people's lives. Yet, FA also recognizes that if they refuse to acknowledge students' resistance to and skepticism of the value of interdisciplinary methodological design, then they run the risk of students dropping the course altogether and enrolling in writing classes where they can fall back

on the familiar routines of reproducing well-established forms and organizational structures. The work, then, for FA, is one of constant recalibration based on understanding where students are coming from, recognizing which disciplinary practices and assumptions they come to the class with, and strategically assessing how to work with students so they will not immediately discredit FA's attempts to introduce interdisciplinary and constructive approaches from the outset.

As a result, FA has had to simplify many aspects of their courses over the years. It now takes them considerably longer to help students come to critical realizations about how to build their own methods that break from the rhetorical school, making it difficult for students to produce the kinds of projects that were previously possible within the constraints of a semester-long course. They have also had to build in more focused working sessions in and outside of class to bridge what students see as a sharp disconnect between the highly step-driven activities they were used to following in their prior writing courses and the open approach of FA's class where students design their own tools and processes in situ. Many of the compromises that FA has made reluctantly over the years to respond to student demands, including agreeing to give more structured deadlines instead of offering flexible deadlines, have not been effective for students: while students enjoy the structure that hard deadlines provide, FA has long maintained that the deadlines in fact hurt students by encouraging them to prioritize writing towards a deadline instead of writing to ensure that their work is, first and foremost, accountable to the stakeholders. Despite the great potential and proven success of FA's work, neither FA nor their constructive and interdisciplinary methodological designs are immune to the power of the rhetorical school and the growing pressures from administrators and students for all writing instructors to adopt the same pedagogical and disciplinary practices.

"Alex": K-12 Education as Context

Unlike the majority of his colleagues who have only taught in higher education, "Alex" (he/him/his) brings to his university writing program extensive experience working in K-12 classrooms and 4-year state universities. These experiences have shaped not only his approaches to working with students of color, but also his belief that academic writing courses have the potential and responsibility to contribute to the work of racial and social justice by becoming spaces where students of color can become more engaged in their academic work. Alex began teaching in K-12 as a substitute teacher while on leave from his PhD program in Ethnic Studies. What was supposed to be a temporary, transitional phase in his academic and professional career became a 7-year journey full of long-term substitute teaching assignments where his stay in one classroom sometimes lasted for months at a time. These experiences gave him a first-hand look into the deep inequities in the K-12 system that disproportionately impacted underrepresented and low-income communities. Because he found himself working both in well-resourced school districts and school districts that had inadequate funding for extended periods of time, Alex quickly became familiar with how students' distinctly different educational experiences affected their academic performance and educational trajectories.

When covering the classes of teachers who had won Teacher of the Year awards or who were working in Distinguished Schools in well-funded districts, Alex described the feeling of being surprised that these classes seemed to "run by themselves." Even as a substitute instructor, he could easily see how the presence of financial and academic resources, appropriate instructional support, an extensive volunteer system, and experienced instructional staff all contributed to a school system where students could work independently no matter who was teaching or leading their class (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). His experiences of working in well-resourced schools were in direct opposition to his experiences working in under-funded schools where, in addition to a lack of parent volunteers and stable instructional

staff, the schools struggled to find substitutes who were willing to work at these schools unless they were paid significantly more money to cover classes. Alex recalled that, due to the high turnover and need for substitute teachers, it was not uncommon when he visited school sites for the secretary to ask him as soon as he arrived whether he wanted to take over classes, even if they were outside his subject area.

In addition to the challenges these schools experienced around staffing, Alex described the problematic racial issues that students faced. Instructors would treat Asian students differently because they believed these students were hardworking compared to students from other racial and ethnic backgrounds. Many students whom their instructors saw as disengaged were in fact good students, but Alex noted how their academic experiences were shaped by their family and economic circumstances: students were often taken out of school by their parents to help with home issues or for economic reasons, and many students were forced to move because they were migrant workers. While his colleagues believed the students were unmotivated, Alex saw that students' inability to engage in their coursework fully was tied to home and economic factors that were outside of the students' immediate control, but which affected their academic performance and educational trajectories. These issues were further compounded by the lack of perceived opportunities in education among the students and their inability to connect with or recognize themselves in the instructors who were teaching their classes. Alex described this as follows: "I saw a lot of these things happening at certain schools like this … they [students] had these negative perceptions: 'What's the point of education? When I get done with high school then I'm just going to live here.' They don't see opportunity and most of the teachers are … from the suburbs so the teachers are not from their own communities. So there are some teachers who look like them, but they live on the good side of town. So there's not that connection with them where people who are teaching them are from the same community as they are" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). These challenges continued to

201

worsen as the school district grew in size. The district chose to respond to the schools' rapid

growth by taking teachers out of their classes to attend district-level professional development

training off campus. While this was a part of the instructors' labor contracts and was meant to

help instructors respond to the growing number of students attending schools in the district,

Alex argues that the very students who "needed teachers in the classroom to be consistent with

them" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019) were unable to develop meaningful

working relationships with their assigned instructors. Instead, Alex was often the third person to

come into the students' classroom in any given week because of the frequency of these

mandatory, out-of-classroom trainings:

> That week, they saw their regular teacher one day, and then the next three to four days they saw two to four other people that would come in every day … that kind of system is not really effective for students because they see someone new every day in the classroom, and these students need consistency to begin with. They need that familiarity of having the teacher in the classroom. But some of these districts … take the teachers out of the classroom a lot. When I go to the schools that are doing really well, their teachers are never out of the classroom. Maybe the entire quarter they might go out one day, and even if they do go out, it's after school. So the K-12 schools that are doing really well, the teachers are normally not out unless they are sick … I feel like it's really disruptive for students to not see the same person every day. (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019)

Alex's experiences of working in K-12 schools and witnessing the vast differences in

students' educational experiences from district to district have since shaped his current work as a

writing instructor at a research university and as an Ethnic Studies instructor at a four-year state

university. He has worked for nearly ten years at the research university as a writing instructor

teaching introductory reading and composition classes, research writing classes, general

education classes, and advanced writing classes predominately to underrepresented minority

students. He recognizes that many of the students he teaches now have faced similar academic

journeys as the students he taught while he was substitute teaching in K-12, and this shapes how

he sees and works with the students in his writing classes. Because he has a clear understanding

of the environments students are coming from — particularly those who come from under-

funded schools and who have been able to make it to the state schools and research universities — he comes into his class aware of what their educational experience "may or may not have taught them" and what they "may have to learn or unlearn as well" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). These understandings form the basis of his interest in doing everything he can to support the students who may not have had the same access to opportunities as students who attended well-funded districts. As such, the contexts that Alex sees as immediately relevant to his current work with students in writing and Ethnic Studies classes include the distinct educational and life experiences between students who attended schools with over ten Advanced Placement courses and students who attended school districts where they never received consistent academic instruction from a full-time teacher. These contexts push him to do what he can to support students who did not have access to the resources that would have prepared them for college.

The challenges his students have faced in their K-12 educational experiences are ones Alex also experienced first-hand as a young student who was placed in the vocational track when he was in K-12. In describing how his own K-12 experiences shaped his educational path, Alex stated that, "I did notice that my friends were in AP classes, were in all of these kinds of classes they got to go on all of these kinds of field trips. I was like, 'oh, I don't get to do that.' But back then, I didn't understand *why*, *how* this was happening and then … also having parents who are refugees who don't speak the language, they didn't know how to ask a counselor what class I should take and things like that. I know from my own experience being a vocational track student too about overcoming those kinds of challenges. And so it wasn't til I got to university that I saw myself — that I could actually be a good student. It wasn't until my third year of college that several professors told me, 'You're actually a good student' … Even just hearing the little things like that, it makes a huge difference that I could be a good student and I started believing that" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Despite being on the

vocational track, Alex did well enough that he was able to meet the minimum requirements to attend a state school after graduating from high school; yet, he maintains that he was not fully prepared to go to a four-year university and knows that many of the students he works with in his classes today similarly did not receive the appropriate support or resources to prepare them to study at a research university. He believes that as an instructor, he is responsible both for acknowledging the challenges students face in their K-12 and college journeys and for working with students to address and mitigate these inequities during their time at the university: "I kind of see that — that's why I don't want to give up on certain students if they're not doing well … I feel because of the people who helped me along the way, I have to help try to help them [the students] or at least help them find resources to be able to stay at the university" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019).

"Their Worst Experience [at This University] Has Been Their Writing Classes": Academic Writing as Transactional, Developmental Writing

Students who attend the research university where Alex teaches and who take academic writing courses rarely hear the kinds of affirmations that Alex received when he was in college and that were critical for helping him begin to see himself as a good student. Outside of his own classes, Alex regularly mentors underrepresented students of color. In the conversations he has had with these students, they have shared with him that "their worst experience [at this university] has been their writing classes, not because it was hard or challenging, but just because of the kind of space it was: they did not want to go, they did not want to do the work. And a lot of them they ended up getting ok grades in it, but it wasn't really a positive experience for them. Several students have shared with me, 'I didn't like that class,' and I feel like even if I was a student in that [writing] class, I would not be successful" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019).

The students' descriptions of their writing classes reveal that these courses are designed in ways that silence, exclude, and marginalize students of color, their experiences, and their voices. Although most universities have, at least on paper, moved away from labeling their writing classes as remedial, most of these classes are still taught as developmental writing courses, which, according to Alex, plays a significant role in students' reluctance to engage in them. To explain why these forms of remediation are so problematic, Alex recalled that when he was a student, he experienced writing classes as entirely product-driven, both in content, pedagogy, and assignments. In his classes, writing was reduced to "a bunch of transactions that you have to do in class — write a paper, quote this, and when you're done with a paper, you never look at it again" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). These experiences led Alex and his fellow students to become disengaged and uninterested in the work. Although Alex's time in writing classes took place well over ten years ago, he sees the same ideological and conceptual frameworks at play in the majority of writing classes taught at his university. The students he mentors see and feel acutely how these notions of remediation and developmental writing structure their levels of engagement in their classes. He described students coming to writing classes with expectations that are difficult to change — expectations that often lead students to put writing classes low on their list of priorities. In the entry-level writing courses he has taught for several years, for instance, Alex has noted that "no one wants to be there because the class — they know it doesn't count for anything" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). The class is the first of a two-part required sequence all students must take to fulfill the university writing requirement, but according to Alex, the department's decision to structure it as a developmental class has contributed to students' reluctance to put their full efforts into it. The course is designed with a purely outcomes- and skills-based framework, with all instructors expected to align their assignments with standardized learning outcomes and to assess student work according to department-approved grading rubrics. Students "know they just need to pass

it, and then they can do [the next writing requirement]" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). As a result, students rarely engage in the course or find meaning in what they learn, instead treating it as a low-priority prerequisite that they simply need to get through. As Alex puts it, "You get the feeling no one is putting their full effort into the class because it is a developmental writing class. They don't enjoy it, and whenever I teach that class, I don't really enjoy it either. It feels like we're going through the motions of the class, but we're not really all there" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019).

According to Alex, student disengagement is pervasive across other writing courses in the department as well, including the required, writing-intensive general education class that is housed in the writing department and which students commonly take at the same time as the entry-level university writing requirement. The general education class helps students build a foundation in interdisciplinary inquiry across the social sciences, humanities, biological sciences, and arts, while also preparing them to develop writing, research, and teamwork skills to support their future studies at the university and beyond. Students listen to guest lectures given by different faculty members across the disciplines on topics that reflect the faculty members' individual research interests. These lectures also provide brief introductions to the disciplinary practices, questions, and research that drive their fields. In weekly discussion sections, students discuss the lecture material, work on group assignments, and respond to the lectures and course readings in weekly analytical and reflective papers to demonstrate that they attended lecture, that they are engaging with the course material, and that they understand courses concepts. Students are also required to attend supplemental events on campus, including lectures, documentary screenings, panel discussions, and more, as a way to connect what they are learning in the class to the various activities taking place at the university.

Despite the department's intention to use the highly regulated and writing-intensive structure of the general education class to support students' reading, writing, and critical

206

thinking skills, Alex noted that this class instead has had the opposite effect on most students, serving instead to "filter out students because there was just so much busy work in there that it was not necessary for them to do" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Students commonly feel overwhelmed by the amount of work the class requires and do not understand how it helps them develop their academic skills. The course was originally designed around a three-part structure: a rotating lecture model where there was no consistency in who gave the lectures or in how lectures were structured; a writing intensive model where students were required to write several pages of analysis and reflection each week about course lecture in order to improve their writing skills; and a supplementary event model where students were expected to attend and link campus events to the content of the course. Within this structure, many students quickly became confused about what they were required to do and how the different parts of the course fit together. According to Alex, this confusion made visible and exacerbated students' differing levels of educational preparation. The students who most enjoyed the course structure and writing-intensive assignments were students who came to the class prepared to study at a four-year university. They could quickly figure out what they needed to do to succeed in the class, whereas students who came from schools with insufficient funding were confused throughout the term about the purpose of the class. The weekly writing responses became a particular point of confusion and frustration for these students, as they did not understand why they were required to write these weekly responses — something that Alex agreed with when he admitted that these writing assignments were "not helpful" and that many of the instructors themselves would "just skim through it [the responses]" instead of giving them their full attention (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). The original intent was that the general education course would help students build their reading, writing, and analytical skills, but students became frustrated by the seeming irrelevance of the assignments in the larger context of what they felt was an already confusing and disjointed course. They disengaged and,

as they did in their required writing class, only did what they needed to in order to pass the class and move on.

Instructors such as Alex, however, had little power to make the necessary changes to ensure these students would be able to engage, given that they had no say in how the class was designed or taught. Since the course was originally designed by one faculty member rather than the individual instructors teaching the discussion sections or delivering the lectures, new faculty members who were unfamiliar with the original visions and conceptual framework of the course had difficulty making sense of the individual assignments and how everything was meant to fit together to support student learning. Alex stated, "It was very very awkward even when we went to meetings [about the general education course]. I wasn't always sure what they were talking about sometimes because a few of the people had been there for years and they've done it the same way every year, and then every semester there are new people who have taught it for the first time" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). With the actual work of the course unclear to both students and instructors, the general education class unintentionally became a site where Alex could see the long-term effects of inequitable access to resources in K-12 education and where poorly thought-out course design, structure, and writing assignments exacerbated these inequities. Students who were less prepared to figure out how to connect the different pieces of the course together struggled to find meaning in the endless list of required but irrelevant writing assignments and quickly disengaged. The instructors themselves, who were powerless to make the necessary changes to work more effectively with students who were struggling, were forced to continue teaching scripted curricula blindly. In both cases, their inability to break free of highly structured writing assignments whose pedagogical function and value were unclear came at great expense to students looking for coherence, meaning, and relevance in their writing classes.

Although Alex largely attributes student disengagement and discomfort in their writing classes to the transactional and developmental nature of these classes, he notes that they must be considered in relation to the mandate that university writing programs help students learn and reproduce established disciplinary conventions and form. In contexts where conventions and standards are tied to developmental English, students often feel that they cannot bring their experiences and selves to their writing classes. Alex describes the function of writing programs as follows: "It's about creating opportunities and creating spaces where students can have a voice and I feel like a lot of times these classes — writing, English classes — in a lot of ways these classes are just to assimilate them [students]. If not to assimilate and to Americanize them, it's to assimilate to the university language …" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Alex maintains that students struggle to become invested in their written work when they are constantly judged by standards that do not reflect their cultures or sense of self and community. The perceived disconnect between who they are, what they are asked to write, and what they are expected to value in their academic work causes many problems for students of color: "It's difficult to be in a class when you don't see yourself, you don't see stories that you're familiar with, you don't see your own communities in what you're reading and learning about … Having a period in the right place matters more than having students understand their own place, their own value, their own perspectives" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). There are concerted efforts among writing instructors and departments to begin using grading contracts in order to move away from the learning outcomes and standards that disenfranchise and negatively impact students of color, but helping students to become engaged and invested in their classes requires more than just changing the grading practices themselves and the standards by which student work is judged. Alex maintains that students need to be exposed to texts written by writers of color and authors who are marginalized, as students often do not have

these opportunities when they are in high school. They need spaces where they can see themselves in the curriculum in order to build confidence and a sense of self and value.

To this end, Alex believes writing programs also need to consider who teaches their classes. At his university where 85% of the students are students of color, there is a significant disconnect between the racial and ethnic makeup of the students and that of the writing department faculty: "Even if we're one of the more diverse writing programs … it [the writing program faculty demographics] doesn't reflect the students and … it creates a lot of tensions that probably should not be there …" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). More specifically, Alex notes that the predominately white faculty makeup and the diverse student population in the writing classes — predominately first-generation college students and students of color — contribute to what he describes as "power issues in the classroom" where "students have been silenced because they can't say or challenge a faculty" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). It is not uncommon in the writing program for racial and political tensions to emerge when students' and faculty members' drastically different lived realities and ways of thinking about and making sense of the world clash within a traditionally structured writing classroom with a clear racial power structure.

To illustrate his point, Alex offered an example of an incident that took place in a writing class after a discussion about Nike's ad campaign featuring Colin Kaepernick, the former quarterback for the San Francisco 49ers who protested police brutality against black communities by kneeling during the national anthem. Kaepernick was heavily critiqued and eventually barred from playing in the NFL because of his decision to protest. When Nike ran their ad campaign featuring Kaepernick with the slogan, "Believe in something. Even if it means sacrificing everything. Just Do It," this move sparked boycotts of Nike products by those who believed Kaepernick's decision to kneel was disrespectful to the American flag. After Nike's ad came out, students at Alex's university began wearing Nikes to class to show their support for

Kaepernick and the protests against police brutality, which compelled a writing instructor in the department to take class time to discuss the Nike ad, the boycotts of Nike products, and Kaepernick's decision to kneel. There was no discernible connection between the course content of the writing class and the issues that the ad campaign and Kaepernick's protest addressed — issues of police brutality, racial profiling, and the differential treatment of communities of color by the police. According to the students enrolled in the course, the instructor failed to present the issues in a critical way, focusing only on how Kaepernick's actions were offensive and disrespectful to white military families, but offering no recognition of or willingness to discuss police brutality or racial profiling in the community — experiences that Alex noted the students of color in the class may have experienced themselves or may have seen.

At the heart of the students' and Alex's concerns with the instructor's analysis was the fact that the instructor left no room for students of color to voice their own opinions or analysis. To them, this amounted to a refusal to acknowledge the validity of their perspectives and experiences on the basis of existing racial power inequities in the classroom. Although the students brought to the classroom extensive knowledge about institutional racism and police brutality as well as their understanding that "you cannot just present on this issue in this way without offering the different sides of it," the writing instructor refused to acknowledge the importance of discussing how issues like racism and police violence "affects people in different ways" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Students were upset that the writing instructor used the classroom space and their authority to discuss the validity of her views and to suppress any dissenting opinions. As Alex put it, "That instructor just completely discounted the entire class because most of the students were students of color. But [the instructor] presented it in a way where [they] had all the power in the classroom to talk about [the incident]. Students that wanted to question — who wanted to have a counter-perspective — they felt like they were silenced because [the instructor] has the authority in the class" (Alex, Participant

Interview, September 29, 2019). One of the writing department's stated learning outcomes is to ensure that students are equipped with the analytical tools to build complex arguments that examine issues from multiple perspectives and that account for different ways of analyzing and assessing issues. Yet, the racial power dynamics in this particular writing classroom and the tensions between students of color's perspectives and their white instructor's perspectives illustrate how the very skills that writing programs teach students to master are often relegated for use within the confines of an assignment or essay. Students in this class were expected to apply critical thinking skills in their written work but were silenced when they tried to use these skills to engage in discussions about institutional racism, to question simplistic narratives, and to challenge the racial power structures in their writing class.

For faculty of color like Alex teaching in writing programs, it is not uncommon for students of color to seek out their mentorship and advice after experiencing racism and racial microaggressions in their writing classes. In fact, Alex argues that the majority of the real conversations that students of color want to have about race and racial inequities in writing classes must take place outside of their classes because students "just don't have that connection to the [white] faculty — they can't address it with the faculty that they may have issues with" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). While Alex acknowledges that writing faculty often bring up issues of racism and racial inequities in their classes, the problem is that "*it's not done in a way that is critical*" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019, emphasis added) or it is done in a way that privileges the instructor's limited understanding or analysis at the expense of students' deep insights. Students of color may be in classes where discussions about these topics take place regularly and where they may read works written by authors of color, but if students' critical perspectives on race are systematically ignored or discounted, writing classes can reproduce the very racial power structures and racist ideologies that they claim to want to address. As one of the few male writing faculty of color in his department, in

his university system, and within research universities, Alex recognizes that "students are kind of surprised to see someone like me teaching writing … they're just not sure how to respond because most of their teachers and professors that they think about who is teaching writing and English are predominately white and white women. For a lot of them, it's new for them to have a person of color teaching writing" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Despite the challenges this presents for him, Alex sees his work in the writing program and with students as crucial because there are so few opportunities for students of color to work with faculty of color in this context. He states that, "Part of the reason why I feel it's worth it is that for the students themselves, having to go through a [writing] class with a person of color is very different than going through a class with a traditional white professor" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). This is particularly true in Alex's department where the majority of writing faculty are white and much older (in their 50s and 60s) compared to students, which creates significant generational as well as racial differences between the faculty and the students of color who have "very different experiences compared to these faculty who may have been teaching for 20-30 years but who don't have those same experiences" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Incidents such as the Nike incident illustrate the important role that faculty of color such as Alex continue to play for students of color in writing programs where their perspectives may not be recognized or engaged. Alex explains that, "Being one of the few faculty of color … a lot of times the students would come to us to let us know, 'this happened and it made it uncomfortable,' or they didn't think it should be this way, or they would question it and they want to talk to someone about it" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). In these ways, Alex and his faculty of color colleagues open spaces where students of color can make sense of the racial hierarchies and power dynamics in their writing classes and share their analysis and perspectives. Here, students can have the complex conversations about

213

race and structural racism that are impossible to foster in writing classrooms where their voices are silenced.

Creating Opportunities for Students of Color to Become Invested in the Curriculum: Academic Writing as Transformational

As a first-generation college student himself who has since spent much of his professional career bearing witness to the detrimental effects that deficit-model pedagogies and racist ideologies in education have on students of color in the K-16 education system, Alex has made it a priority to teach his writing courses differently. Given the many factors that make it difficult for students of color to engage in their academic writing classes, one of Alex's priorities is to connect with his students, all of whom are fully capable of doing well in their courses, but who may not have the motivation, time, or confidence to excel in their writing classes. Alex notes the long history of students of color at his university "constantly being told they're not good enough … that what they're doing is wrong" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). He sees this as a critical problem that has long-lasting consequences for students. Students often fail their assignments and writing classes for making minor mistakes in their papers or for only partially completing assignments. In response to what he sees as gross structural and racial inequities in the education system and in academic writing classes more specifically, Alex tries to challenge these negative, punitive approaches to writing that unfairly punish students of color and that reproduce systemic inequities and racial subordination. Rather than focusing on task-driven assignments and course design that equate the quantity of product produced with mastery of skills, Alex instead chooses to design his class around topics that allow students to build on what they already know. He encourages students to develop their own interests and to apply and deepen their knowledge by connecting course topics to their own disciplines.

This is a particularly important opportunity for students who plan to major in STEM fields. The majority of students at Alex's university are STEM majors, but the demands on them to excel in the coursework for their majors and the lack of writing instruction in their STEM courses mean that students rarely prioritize or see the relevance of their composition courses beyond the recognition that they must fulfill the lower-division university writing requirements to graduate. There are no writing classes housed in any of the STEM departments in Alex's university, and although students have the option to take an upper division writing-in-the-disciplines course (e.g., writing in STEM or writing in the social sciences, which are both housed in the writing program) as one of their required electives, there is no upper division writing requirement for STEM majors or within the university's general education requirements. This means that the majority of students majoring in STEM never take another writing class once they complete their lower-division reading and composition sequence. Although it is critical for students in STEM to receive hands-on training and experience in writing within the discipline, students of color rarely have the opportunity to join the research groups or labs where advanced science writing instruction takes place. The disparities in student access to opportunities for advanced writing instruction thus exacerbate existing inequities along racial and economic lines and put pressure on writing instructors like Alex to help students of color begin to see and experience writing as an integral part of learning in STEM within students' first or second semesters in college. They know that students' lower-division writing classes or their upper-division writing-in-the-disciplines class may be the only opportunity the students will have to build the hands-on writing projects that will help them advance in the field. For Alex, then, the priority is to find ways to help students change how they think about writing early on so they can become invested in writing over the span of their academic and professional careers. He allows students to bring their disciplinary interests and expertise to their lower-division writing projects so they can see how writing is central to their work and growth within different disciplines.

215

At the time of our conversations, the general topic structuring Alex's writing course was food — one that he believed was open and relevant enough to give all students the space to "enter the conversation because they all have something to say about [it]" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). When Alex first began teaching in his writing department, many of his colleagues used food as their course theme, but he found that they taught this topic from a very narrow perspective. They expected their students to examine and write about food writers who were predominately white men and were asked to discuss simple questions such as, "why we eat food." In an effort to help his students become more engaged in the material and the writing process, Alex made a concerted effort to reconceptualize what it meant to teach a writing class about food for a class where the majority of students were students of color and first-generation college students. Over the years, he has turned this into a class that is largely taught from an ethnic studies and labor history perspective. With his interdisciplinary background, Alex models for his students how to examine and analyze a seemingly simple topic like food through interdisciplinary lenses. He offers perspectives and analytical tools that transform how they look at these issues, from the types of questions they ask and the types of theories they bring to their analysis to the kinds of work they envision their research will do for communities in the real world.

As someone with a background in ethnic studies, urban studies and urban development, anthropology, and race and ethnicity, Alex has been able to use these interdisciplinary and critical approaches to help students situate their analysis of food within the contexts of race, racialized labor, exploitation, and the unequal distribution of resources in a racialized economy. He described, for instance, having his students study food within the context of labor history, race, and agricultural systems, which opens spaces for students to study the central role workers of color have played in agricultural work. He notes that his students of color are surprised to learn the history of how other racial and ethnic groups were exploited in agricultural work, including

the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino workers, because they see agricultural work, agricultural labor issues, and migrant labor as predominately Latinx issues rather than part of a longer history of the exploitation of people of color. They rarely have the opportunity to learn about these shared histories of exploitation in their K-12 classes or in their university classes. As Alex puts it, "Our economy relies on … creat[ing] these problems for us: we need workers, but we don't give them legal rights, legal status, and in this way they become easily exploited. So for a lot of students, they've never been taught that before … they think of it as a Latino-only issue. But I try to expand it for them a little bit — that it affects a lot of communities of color. Even different racial and ethnic groups have been in conflict with each other over these kinds of issues about who is doing the work and whether they should join each other or are they going to break each others' strikes" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). For many of Alex's students who have only learned about César Chávez in their other classes when it comes to agricultural labor history, these discussions open the space to begin studying and talking about agricultural labor history in different ways: instead of seeing migrant agricultural work as a Latinx issue, students begin situating their analysis in the context of Asian American labor history, racial and ethnic conflict, and cross-racial alliances. This requires revisiting the mainstream narratives they have been taught about Chávez and the United Farm Workers and rewriting them in the context of Filipino labor history such as Larry Itliong's work with Filipinx farm workers and the UFW. For Alex's Latinx students and Filipinx students, learning about the U.S.'s long history of exploiting the labor of different racial and ethnic groups offers them new ways to understand history while also giving them the chance to see themselves in the curriculum. They become engaged in the work and find ways to connect their research about food and agricultural labor history to their own histories and interests.

Because Alex's writing courses are research-focused, he also encourages students to study this topic from different disciplinary perspectives that are connected either to their

academic majors and expertise or to their personal interests. Alex encourages his students, for instance, to link their study of food to their interests in public health, labor, immigration, and more, which "allow[s] them to build upon what they may already know and what they want to know more about" and to engage in something they are invested in and motivated to study (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). This work is thus meant to be transformative: it allows students to see that their histories are a central part of the class, while also giving them the space, language, and theoretical foundations to engage in the kinds of critical discussions and research about race, racial subordination, and cross-racial solidarity that are missing from other writing classes and departments on campus.

Alex sees his efforts to bring critical discussions about race, labor, and communities of color into his writing class as an opportunity for students of color to become more invested in their composition courses and to engage in important questions about race and ethnicity. He notes that we need to remember that while students might be from underrepresented ethnic and racial backgrounds, they may not have had exposure to any kind of ethnic studies training in their education prior to attending the university, which directly affects their ability to talk and write about race. He states, "Our campus is 85% or more students of color, but in the K-12, they've been taught to be colorblind. They've been taught we all want to be the same. And so even though they are students of color, they don't have the language, they don't have the experience to talk about race because, again, most of their teachers have been … suburban, white teachers in K-12, so these teachers don't talk about race. They talk about just standards" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Alex attributes these gaps in the K-12 curriculum to the fact that K-12 teachers themselves have not been trained to talk about race, let alone about the history of communities of color. As he puts it, K-12 teachers have also "been trained to be colorblind," which means that students of color have "never been taught that they can write about [these issues]" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019).

Students may never realize they have important things to say about these issues or that their analysis can be the starting point for developing research projects that build critical contexts and ask insightful questions. Alex's priority, then, is to build the spaces where students of color can learn to have critical conversations about race so they can study and write about topics that directly connect with their lives, experiences, and interests.

While Alex acknowledges that students are not always comfortable talking about race at the start of the semester, he maintains that "especially for the students that are really interested in these kinds of topics, I think it can greatly shape their performance in the class" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Students in his class who had been earning "C's" at the start of the semester, for instance, and who initially struggled to connect with course material suddenly became more engaged when they began talking about race, ethnicity, labor, and immigration. They began to earn high B's and A-'s on their papers — a shift that Alex attributes to their ability to write about topics and issues that were of interest to them and whose importance extended beyond the parameters of the assignment itself. He states, "They started not really wanting to do the work, but at the end [of the semester], I specifically remember I had several students that, because of what they were writing about, they were much more invested. *They felt like what they were doing mattered* … For some students that are really interested in this, it does help them to improve in the class when they see themselves in the curriculum or things that they know about their communities, their families, or relatives that have gone through these kinds of experiences. I feel like they become much more invested in writing a paper about this" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019, emphasis added).

When students analyze issues that are of immediate personal and political importance to them and to their communities — where there are real consequences of failing to write and learn about these issues — students' perceptions about writing and the work of academic writing changes. Composition classes can play a critical role in students' academic and personal

219

growth when their voices, histories, perspectives, and experiences are not only reflected in the curriculum, but when the urgency and importance of writing about these experiences are made visible. Within the context of a writing program and university where students of color have few opportunities in their classes to discuss issues with a critical lens that centers race and the experiences of communities of color, Alex's work challenges the status quo. By centering their voices, experiences, and communities and by showing them how these perspectives can guide their analysis, he carves out space for students of color to analyze issues in ways they are unable to in their other classes. In this sense, Alex not only helps students of color see that their work and insights actually matter, but in doing so, encourages them to begin rewriting the dominant narratives that have structured their educational experiences and the field of composition studies as they write for his class.

Preparing The Next Generation of Teachers

One of the ongoing challenges Alex faces in his work as a writing instructor at a research university is the difficulty of being able to teach a wide range of writing classes that give him the latitude to work on different aspects of academic writing and analysis with students of color. As a member of a writing department that largely offers lower-division writing classes that fulfill university writing requirements, there are few opportunities for instructors to expand their teaching repertoire and to design the kinds of upper-division and specialized courses that would give them the space to teach and work with students in more complex ways. For the first five years of his time as a writing instructor, Alex was assigned to teach the same research writing courses each semester. Despite his efforts to design a unique research writing class for students that drew on his background in ethnic studies and urban planning and development, he described the experience of teaching the same class semester after semester as limiting because it

felt like he was "only using part of my capacity, what I could do" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019).

Like many writing instructors and non-tenure track instructors, Alex works at multiple universities, but whereas other instructors may "freeway fly" for economic reasons, Alex's commitment to teaching in the Ethnic Studies department at a local state university comes from his desire to work with students in different capacities. He recognizes that the work needed to support students and communities of color is multifaceted. While writing classes such as the ones he has designed at his research university offer one space to do this kind of work, these courses reach only a portion of the students in the state who may benefit from studying issues through the lens of race and power and from the perspective of racial and ethnic groups. Moreover, because these classes are housed in a writing department that mostly offers lower-division courses and rarely allows instructors like Alex to teach more advanced or specialized classes, Alex's work in the research university does not necessarily reach a wide range of students or give them opportunities to have discussions about race at critical moments in their academic careers. To expand the scope of his teaching and to support students in different capacities, Alex works part-time teaching ethnic studies classes at a local state university where for the past three years he has prepared the next generation of K-12 and college instructors to work with students of color in diverse classrooms.

Over the past few years, there has been growing interest among K-12 school districts, state universities, and research universities in having students take either an ethnic studies class or a class about racial and social justice before they graduate. In response to these changing perceptions about ethnic studies as well as administrators' recognition that instructors at all educational levels teach increasingly diverse student populations, state universities have made concerted efforts to ensure that both undergraduate and graduate students who intend to pursue careers as educators have sufficient training and content expertise to work with students of all

racial and ethnic backgrounds. In partnership with their Ethnic Studies department, the state university that Alex works at has thus developed course requirements in ethnic studies for prospective K-12 teachers while they are still completing their undergraduate degrees to ensure they have the needed ethnic studies foundation to work with the diverse communities and classrooms of which they will be a part when they begin their credentialing programs. Due to the shortage of teachers in K-12 schools, graduate students in teaching credential programs often are already in the classroom teaching and working directly with students and parents of color in their first year.

Alex's task has been to introduce prospective K-12 teachers to the forms of critical analysis and theories that center the experiences and histories of racial and ethnic groups while also helping them understand that "they can't choose their students in the classroom and so they should be prepared to work with students from diverse backgrounds [and to] work with parents from those backgrounds" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). Teaching these classes has given Alex the opportunity to grow and learn as a teacher in ways that are not possible within a research university writing program. In addition to being able to train the next generation of K-12 instructors in ethnic studies and to teach in the discipline he is formally trained in, Alex has also been able to link his different areas of expertise (Ethnic Studies, writing, K-12, and higher education) together in ways that can address what he sees as some of the most pressing gaps in students' and prospective teachers' educational experiences. For many of the prospective teachers with whom he works at the state university, Alex's ethnic studies course may be the only one that they ever take and the only formal instruction they receive in how ethnic studies can inform their work with students of color and with students' parents and caregivers. By extension, this may also be the only ethnic studies class in which they will ever receive formal writing instruction — something Alex notes that the future teachers never anticipate because they enter his class thinking it will "only" be a class on race and ethnicity. He feels that it is

necessary to introduce writing as a central part of his class because he recognizes that writing and knowing how to communicate effectively is essential to any educator's training. Alex's insistence on teaching writing as a vital component of ethnic studies and prospective instructor training speaks to the fact that, when conceptualized as a process of discovery, transformation, and methodological innovation, academic writing can be an integral part of learning rather than a tool only used to report on information and facts students already know. Within the specific ethnic studies context in which Alex teaches, writing as a process of inquiry-based learning is particularly relevant, both for the prospective instructors who learn through writing how to build the contexts and understandings that will inform their work with students of color, and for their future students who will, in turn, also see the urgency of building new contexts of understanding as they investigate and write about issues that directly affect their communities and lives.

Alex's commitment to building spaces in education where students of color can thrive and have their voices heard is a multi-dimensional project. Even as he helps students of color at his research university to write their voices and critical perspectives into being, he is also working to train the next generation of instructors who will eventually be responsible for creating similar spaces of possibility and transformation for future students of color. In this sense, although Alex teaches two different courses that span two different departments and institutions with different histories, ideological approaches, and charges, they both work to address the disparities in educational and life opportunities that disproportionately affect underrepresented students of color. The educational future that Alex envisions and is working towards moves away from the transactional delivery of product and instead moves towards a pedagogy and process of critical dialogue that centers the real lives and insights that students and communities of color have to offer. Alex's efforts to build educational spaces that are both personally and structurally transformative are thus fundamentally at odds with the stated mission and charge of his research

223

university, which is to increase the numbers of students of color who enter STEM majors and who pursue careers in STEM successfully. Yet, Alex is clear-sighted in his belief that the fixation on STEM is a short-sighted vision that overlooks the great need for students of color to go into teaching. If students of color have the resources, encouragement, and courage to consider this path, this opens up many important possibilities for the education system, for the students themselves, and for their communities. Alex states,

> There is such a push for STEM, and I feel that we miss the opportunity for students to do other stuff that they would enjoy because I know that in [this region] there's such a need for teachers as well. There's a shortage of teachers already. It's great that some of these students … want to go into STEM, and I know that students of color are underrepresented in these areas and fields, but I feel that some of them will be much better at teaching … when they finish they can go back in their communities and change their communities in different ways. But a lot of it comes down to economics, where they want to try to get a good job and so they think that these opportunities in STEM fields will provide them with that. But I know from many of the … students I mentor that that's not a reality. When they get done with a BA in biology, chemistry, biochem, all these kinds of fields, when they get done with that, they can't do anything with it … They may be able to create more change as teachers and working in the community. (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019)

Alex has done significant work in his writing classes, ethnic studies classes, and mentoring work to introduce students of color to different fields of study and to the alternative perspectives, histories, and ways of looking at issues that make visible the importance of community-based research and work. He acknowledges, however, that this is not enough on its own to lay an appropriate foundation for students to pursue career paths in teaching or in community-based work. The lack of an existing infrastructure at the university to support students who are interested in teaching careers and who want to their education to benefit their communities is a significant impediment. Alex's research university, for instance, does not have an education department, which makes it difficult for instructors to direct students to a natural pathway or pipeline to these careers with the kinds of resources and opportunities they would need to thrive. Unless they have faculty mentors such as Alex who can work with them directly or who can connect them with faculty or opportunities at other campuses or in the local

224

community, it is difficult for students of color to learn about and become involved in teaching while they are undergraduates.

Alex also notes that the physical structure and location of the campus present significant difficulties for students who are interested in becoming involved in the community during their undergraduate career. The city lacks an efficient and effective public transportation system, which, when combined with the timing and scheduling of classes and the fact that the campus is located far from where community members actually live and work, makes it difficult for students to work in the local community. The long wait times for buses and inefficient bus routes make what would normally be a 15 minute, one-way trip by car to a community-based volunteer or internship site an hour-long ride for students who depend on public transit. This makes any community-based work during the week nearly impossible, given that doing so requires at least two hours for commute-time alone to and from campus and the need to fit this in between students' regular classes. Alex argues, "It's not really effective for students that want to get out in the community and to do that kind of work or make those kinds of connections …" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019). His students have even complained that the university's investment in a new student parking lot, which was built to address the shortage of student parking on campus, fails to offer the kind of support that students of color are looking for when they want to become more involved in the community. Students must have enough resources to be able to afford a car, and, because of the campus expansion and sprawl, those with cars must be able to schedule their classes to allow for a 20 minute, fast-paced hike to get from the parking lot to the campus buildings.

While these details might seem ancillary to the larger vision Alex has of students being able to pursue a professional future in community-based education, they contribute to what Alex sees as many of the structural barriers in place that make it challenging for students of color to see themselves as community leaders. These structural barriers also make it difficult for faculty

to help students see the value and long-term impacts of working in and with communities directly. Despite these structural challenges, however, he continues to find ways to encourage students to become involved to the extent that they can and continues to build the kinds of mentoring relationships with students that he knows are critical for students of color as they navigate their way through the racial power hierarchies that structure the majority of their classes. The students of color who take his writing courses may ultimately choose to pursue professional careers that have nothing to do with education or community-based work, but Alex continues to lay a critical foundation in his writing classes to guide the next generation as he centers students' voices, perspectives, and critical analysis as the key drivers of possibility and social transformation.

Conclusion:

At the start of the semester, Alex asks his writing students to think about what is means to be a good writer. Students tend to respond to his question with the perception that "a good class is where you enjoy the class," but Alex encourages them to think differently about these issues. He pushes them to assess how different disciplinary priorities and ideologies, racial and gender biases, and institutional values shape how we are trained to think about and define what constitutes a "good" class. He asks them to consider the following: "Just because you enjoy a class doesn't mean it's a good class … Is it a good class because you liked the professor? [Because] you enjoy the class — you had a good time? *But what about a class that changes you? What about a class that transforms you*?" (Alex, Participant Interview, September 29, 2019, emphasis added).

Alex's and FA's visions of creating writing classes that have the potential to change or transform students are increasingly at odds with the normative values of research universities that frame the value of academic writing and academic writing skills as their transferability

226

across disciplines and applicability to future careers. The rhetorics allow students to adopt well-established analytical frameworks and writing practices in composition programs, but to FA and Alex, this often means that writing instructors overlook the potential their classes have to become spaces that challenge racial and social inequities in and outside of academia. At the heart of FA's and Alex's work is their belief that students of color should not only be able to see themselves in writing program curriculum and methods, but that they should also be able to work on projects that will have real impacts on the lives of people in their communities. This requires creating spaces in writing classes where students of color can build and construct their own methods, forms of critical analysis, and ways of constructing knowledge. With these opportunities, they can work on meaningful projects that require new perspectives and interventions and can, in turn, begin rewriting composition narratives and methodologies for social and structural change. In preparing students of color to see that their insights and perspectives not only matter — but have the power to drive both methodological and structural change — FA and Alex create spaces in writing classes where students can challenge the developmental nature of university writing programs and their racial power hierarchies, while also building the interdisciplinary methods and forms of analysis that do not yet exist in their fields but that are urgently needed.

Alex's and FA's efforts to reconceptualize and reenvision the methods and the work of academic courses are not unique to them. In fact, the interdisciplinary nature of both Alex's and FA's professional and academic backgrounds illustrates that their pedagogical approaches are grounded in critical methodological and theoretical work from Ethnic Studies, urban studies, the humanities, social sciences, and STEM, as well as their practical experience working with students in non-writing contexts. Writing classes are not the only spaces where students can take up the work of reimagining and reconceptualizing context in order to create structural change. In this sense, Alex's and FA's reimagining of writing classes as spaces to intervene in and disrupt

227

the reproduction of racial hierarchies follows the lead of other fields like Ethnic Studies whose methodological, theoretical, and applied work emerge directly from the lived experiences and knowledge of populations who have historically fought to redefine and rewrite dominant narratives. By housing their work in traditional writing programs, however, and by giving students the space to construct contexts and novel interdisciplinary methods that do not yet exist in other disciplines, FA and Alex make visible the potential to turn academic writing programs into different spaces that redefine the mission and work of academic writing. Writing classes do not have to continue aligning themselves with developmental English curricula or teaching pedagogies that reinforce and reproduce the status quo. They have the potential to become spaces where students of color can figure out how to make vital analytical and methodological contributions to broader efforts in and outside of academia to dismantle structural racism. As FA and Alex have shown through their own work, this requires challenging the tendency to practice writing as the work of *writing about and reporting on*. Instead, instruction must move towards *building understandings with and working directly with* communities and people so that new contexts, methods, and writing can emerge from and with the voices and perspectives of the stakeholders themselves. In these ways, students of color can work on research projects that Alex's students describe as ones that matter. If academic writing classes are rooted in material conditions, lived experiences, and the commitment to working towards real social and structural change, they can transform not only the students themselves, but also communities and lives.

Such efforts to rethink the goals and processes of academic writing on a large scale are not easy. The perceived value of the rhetorical school's logic, methods, and skills continues to persist in writing programs and increasingly shapes what students believe writing classes should be and do. FA's increasing struggles to convince students that constructive methods will serve them better in the long term than the convenience of the rhetorics highlight the difficulty of

adopting teaching methods that go against the standard principles and pedagogies in most writing classes. Yet, FA's and Alex's efforts to rethink and reconceptualize academic writing for students in and outside of the classroom offer important models for how other writing instructors might carve a path forward for themselves and for their students. They recognize that instructors can do far more once they begin to follow and prioritize the work, perspectives, and interests of the students themselves and once they begin to link the struggles for racial and social justice in research universities to the same fights taking place in K-12, community colleges, state universities, community-based education programs, and tutorial centers. They understand that they must see students' experiences and their unique ways of constructing knowledge as always relevant in order to design writing classes where students of color can begin to do the kind of work that matters to them. As students of color design their own interdisciplinary methods and build new contexts of understanding, they help to make visible the methodological and practical directions writing instructors need to move in to build new possibilities and spaces for meaningful transformation.

Chapter Four: Minor Innovation and Selective Mechanisms for Advancement: The Reproduction of the Heroic WPA and Teaching Excellence Narratives in University Writing Programs

Writing instructors constantly develop new pedagogical approaches in their courses to challenge racist power structures in writing instruction and academia, but there is a growing recognition that, to reach more students and to change disciplinary ideologies and practices, this work must be supported institutionally and structurally. Genevieve García de Müeller and Iris Ruiz's (2017) study illustrates that while university writing programs often recognize that their writing courses reproduce racial inequities, they often lack the race-conscious resources and support structures that instructors and students need in order to have productive conversations about race. The responsibility of developing effective race conscious curricula and training programs thus disproportionately falls on faculty of color; yet, as faculty of color try to help their colleagues improve their pedagogical and assessment practices, they find themselves increasingly at odds with white faculty and administrators who believe that the existing (or non-existent) methods for addressing race, ethnicity, and multilingualism in their department are sufficient, or even "very effective" (p. 25). The lack of structural support available to these instructors and the undertheorization of how to address race in writing classrooms make it difficult for faculty of color to create lasting and widespread change: instructors can easily make local changes in their individual classrooms, but their individual efforts do not necessarily lead to sustained and structural changes within their larger departments. García de Müeller and Ruiz argue that writing programs must prioritize building structural support for students and faculty of color by diverting more resources into institutional diversity initiatives. Data from their study shows that introducing materials on race in teaching practicums, pedagogical trainings, and professional development workshops creates opportunities for writing instructors to have

productive dialogues about race, ethnicity, multilingualism, and colorism. This not only helps white instructors become more adept at "address[ing] race in articulate and concrete ways" (p. 36-37), but also increases reports among writing faculty of color that race and racism (as they pertain to writing, assessments, pedagogy, and student support) are discussed and addressed more effectively on a programmatic and institutional level. García de Müeller and Ruiz's (2017) research supports the calls from other scholars in the field for more sustained attention to the centrality of race and racial discourse in writing instruction (Clary-Lemon, 2009; Kynard, 2013; Prendergast, 1998; Royster & Williams, 1999; Villanueva, 1999). Their research demonstrates that individual instructors' efforts to change conversations around race in writing programs must be supplemented with financial resources and programmatic offerings in order to create sustained ideological change.

For García de Müeller and Ruiz (2017), writing program administrators (WPAs) are the key to securing both the resources and institutional support necessary to drive programmatic and ideological change in composition. They argue that "there is no doubt that WPAs hold a great deal of power to affect change in writing program curricula due to their ability to dictate what happens in terms of pedagogical training, faculty development, assessment practices, and student support (Halpern) — areas that our survey focused upon" (p. 20). Their call to action and their faith in WPAs' efforts echo Porter et al. (2000), who similarly recognize that dedicated WPAs who have fought to gain "material resources, control over processes, and disciplinary validity" (p. 614) for their departments have been able to secure the necessary funding and administrative support to create new writing labs, rhetoric and composition graduate programs, and writing majors. Both recognize that because writing programs place a significant amount of power in the hands of their faculty-administrators who are responsible for determining the ideological directions and pedagogical focus for their programs, these WPAs are best positioned

231

to fight for the resources needed to change the racial power structures in university writing instruction.

The turn to WPAs to affect structural change, however, must be considered in the context of neoliberalism and academia's investment in market and managerial logics. Pauline Lipman (2011) describes neoliberalism as "an ideological project to reconstruct values, social relations, and social identities — to produce a new social imaginary" (p. 10). Through policies, governance structures, and discourses that emphasize individual freedom and autonomy over collectivity and social responsibility, the neoliberal project has not only restructured and reorganized society according to market logics, but has also transformed how individuals come to understand their social identities and their social relations with others (Lipman, 2011). Within the education system, neoliberalism has introduced market logics that promote education as a private good whose benefits accrue to the individual student consumer. Universities and departments have steadily adopted management techniques to ensure the ongoing production of economically efficient forms of teaching and learning, thus transforming the institution from a perceived public good meant to benefit society as a whole into a site for private investment whose effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity can be measured and evaluated through standards, performance indicators, and production targets (Davies & Saltmarsh, 2007; Lipman, 2011). This has led to the parallel creation of a managerial class who are charged with overseeing the smooth operation of the neoliberal university and who are responsible for ensuring that these business targets are met efficiently and effectively.

In university writing programs that have, like many academic departments, turned to contingent labor to increase their economic efficiency, underlying tensions between contingent faculty and the WPAs have surfaced as neoliberal practices create a stratified and increasingly precarious instructional labor system. Contingent faculty and WPAs do not share the same interests or responsibilities in the neoliberal university, leading to disagreements over what it

232

means to push for structural change in programs that have historically operated through the ongoing exploitation of contingent faculty and graduate students under the management of WPAs. While some writing program faculty may believe that they retain some degree of autonomy in their daily work despite the rise of management imperatives and can still shape the direction of their department, Gary Rhoades (1998) argues that within the complex business and organizational networks that now structure universities, faculty have become managed professionals who now have little authority over crucial decision-making processes in their departments and universities. For writing programs in particular, administrators are responsible for creating increasingly flexible ranks of instructional faculty capable of meeting the constantly changing student demand for courses in economically efficient ways. To this end, they have managerial discretion (Rhoades, 1998) over how to reorganize academic programs and the workforce to meet market needs. The need for a "just in time" labor pool and an organizational system capable of managing this increasingly flexible workforce has led not only to the rise of the WPA in writing programs, but also to the growing divisions between WPAs, tenure-track faculty, and contingent faculty. As they compete for employment opportunities, job security, and resources while learning how to demonstrate their continued value and relevance within the assessment- and standards-driven culture of the academy, contingent faculty realize that their interests and needs rarely align with the interests and responsibilities of the WPAs who manage and supervise them (Bousquet, 2008; Bousquet, Scott, & Parascondola, 2004; Kahn, Lalicker & Lynch-Biniek, 2017; Strickland, 2004).

Composition research commonly assumes that even within the neoliberal university, WPAs and writing instructors share similar experiences and visions for their work and for students (Porter et al., 2000). This expectation drives the "heroic WPA" narrative (Bousquet, 2004) and inspires calls for WPAs to lead efforts to change writing programs. In the heroic WPA narrative, WPAs who are equally invested in fulfilling shared goals with the instructors they

233

supervise lead the charge to "professionalize" writing programs and initiate large-scale institutional action and change. By using their research backgrounds and position in the university, WPAs are able to focus attention on the need for and value of research in writing programs (Porter et al., 2000, p. 614) while also developing situated and rhetorically-based institutional critiques to advance new initiatives. According to this narrative, the WPAs are the key to transforming and securing the futures of writing programs and their instructors: they are able to shift institutional priorities and resources towards writing programs through their personal commitment to advocate for their faculty and through their ability to enhance the field's reputation and status among influential administrators and researchers (Porter et al., 2000, p. 629-630). Bousquet's (2004, 2008) research, however, reminds us that the field's tendency to conflate the interests of the heroic WPA and writing instructors in the all-encompassing "we" in fact obscures important distinctions between WPAs' professional responsibilities and composition instructors' labor struggles in the neoliberal university. According to Bousquet (2004), WPAs' responsibility as managers is to "directly administer the labor of other members" (Bousquet, 2004, p. 15) in order to advance the economic and ideological interests of the university. Their attempts to align themselves with writing instructors through sympathy, identification, and even first-hand understanding based on their prior experiences as former adjuncts ignore the fact that, within the neoliberal university, they are responsible for carrying out the directives and agendas of upper management — not for prioritizing the labor needs of instructional faculty. Strickland (2004) describes composition instructors' failure to recognize that their writing programs now serve an administrative and managerial function as the "managerial unconscious" of composition. She argues that this managerial unconscious contributes to the ongoing maintenance of the heroic WPA narrative in writing programs, but leads to significant "material economic and political consequences for the huge numbers of contingent faculty who teach most first-year writing classes" (Strickland, 2004, p. 47). Within the

234

economic and efficiency imperatives of the business model of education, changes that WPAs institute rarely lead to equitable changes in writing instructors' labor conditions or in the educational experiences of the students they teach. The labor structures, budgets, and evaluation processes WPAs oversee are intended to advance the economic and political interests of the neoliberal university rather than the interests of the social good.

This chapter examines the history of tensions between writing program administrators, tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure track writing faculty that have arisen as a result of the neoliberal project in education. It argues that these histories are critical for understanding the significant challenges that composition instructors face as they attempt to transform the racial power structures both in their own classrooms and within the reading and composition field more generally. These histories offer insight into why WPA-led efforts to dismantle systemic racism in writing departments have historically failed to bring about the structural changes that both writing instructors and students of color envision. The chapter begins by examining the failures of the Wyoming Resolution and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing — two seminal documents meant to change the hierarchies and associated inequities in working conditions between tenure-track faculty and contingent faculty in college and university writing programs. It demonstrates how these documents helped first to expose and then to solidify the problematic professional and labor-based distinctions between writing program administrators and instructors that have since come to characterize writing departments. Taking the University of California as a case study in how these tensions between management and faculty persist across curricular and pedagogical work, this chapter argues that writing program managers and university administrators still retain a disproportionate amount of control over processes that contingent and full-time writing faculty presumably control or have significant power over. These include collective bargaining, teaching review processes internal to

their departments, curricular innovation, and definitions of teaching "excellence." I examine the teaching excellence and merit review process at the University of California alongside a writing instructor's first-hand analysis of these review processes in order to show how excellence review procedures reproduce managerial interests at the expense of both faculty and students of color. By showing how power differentials between WPAs and contingent faculty were solidified through the CCCC Statement and continue to be reinforced through collective bargaining, this chapter makes visible the critical contexts that explain why and how writing instructors' attempts to fight for structural change through the ideal of the heroic WPA have failed repeatedly. In doing so, it also brings to light the unreported work lecturers are doing with their students to transform racial power structures in their classrooms in the absence of managerial oversight and administrative restrictions.

"We should *see and say*": The Wyoming Resolution and the Rise of the Heroic WPA

The Wyoming Resolution and CCCC "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing" made visible the disparate interests and commitments of WPAs and composition instructors. The 15th annual Wyoming Conference on English brought together writing and English instructors, researchers, and graduate students from different sectors of education in 1986 to discuss "Language and the Social Context" (McDonald & Schell, 2011, p. 362). While the conference was not intended to focus on labor issues in composition, the conference took place in the midst of a growing concern in the field over several issues, including tensions between rhetoric and composition programs and English programs, the lack of tenure track positions in composition for instructors with PhDs, and the employment and working conditions of part-time instructors (McDonald & Schell, 2011). In the face of these immediate concerns, participants began discussing issues more relevant to their experiences than the conference theme — namely, "what is the social context for writing teachers?" (Robertson,

Crowley & Lentricchia, 1987, p. 274). During the opening days of the conference, participants

engaged in informal conversations with each other where they shared stories about

unsustainable teaching loads, problematic tenure review processes, gender-based academic status,

lack of benefits, exclusion from academic life and lack of respect despite holding PhDs, and

exploitative working conditions. The cross-sectoral nature of the conference (which included

high school, community college, public university, and private university instructors who were

contingent, tenured, and graduate students) quickly exposed deep resentment on the part of

contingent faculty as well as the total obliviousness of most tenured English faculty towards

their privilege and protected status (McDonald & Schell, 2011; Robertson, Crowley &

Lentricchia, 1987). None of the conference presenters, however, addressed these pressing

concerns about writing instructors' labor conditions until Linda Flower's and James Sledd's panel

presentation. In his presentation, Sledd referenced the recent firing of sixty-five non-tenure-

track composition lecturers at the University of Texas at Austin for demanding the same rights

as tenure-track faculty. He condemned the "departmental dominance of the literati" for holding

as their "primary concern … their own status and comfort, which research and publication, they

hope, will guarantee" (Sledd, as quoted in McDonald & Schell, 2011, p. 364-365). His talk named

the privileges that allowed tenured faculty to exploit contingent faculty, but also pointed out

what he saw as the hypocrisy of the contingent writing instructors who sought for themselves

the same privileges and protections afforded to the tenured professors who exploited them

(Robertson, Crowley & Lentricchia, 1987). He argued that, "Whatever else is done or not done,

we should practice the critical thinking that we talk so much about. We should *see and say* — see

our work in its full social and educational context, speak out against the hypocrisies of our

society and our profession even when whistleblowers take a beating and our best efforts seem

ludicrous and pretentious" (Sledd, as quoted in McDonald & Schell, 2011, p. 365).

Sledd's open condemnation marked a critical moment for writing instructors. His call to action made visible the deep ideological and material divisions between tenure-track faculty who were invested in the privileges and promised security of research, management, and tenure, and contingent faculty who were committed to teaching but relegated to precarious working positions. Yet, his talk also forced all instructors to confront their complicity and role in reinforcing the very system and problems they were challenging. The conversations that Sledd's talk inspired set the groundwork for the Wyoming Conference Resolution (now known as the Wyoming Resolution), a document written by conference participants who sought to draw attention to the exploitative labor conditions that post-secondary writing instructors faced. Recognizing the need for widespread structural change and collective action, the authors of the resolution wrote the document with the intent of starting a national movement to challenge these labor abuses. Central to the spirit of the Wyoming Resolution was that it was written by non-tenure track writing instructors who wanted the document to empower their colleagues. They wanted to build a formal grievance process that would not only hold institutions accountable, but that would also allow instructors themselves to transform their exploitative working conditions into environments that would reflect their needs and priorities (Robertson, Crowley & Lentricchia, 1987). To this end, the Wyoming Resolution instituted formal procedures through which writing instructors could file grievances and censure institutions that failed to comply with professional standards for salary, working conditions, resources, and benefits (McDonald & Schell, 2011). Importantly, its provisions were deliberately written in language and with procedural guidelines that valued and legitimized the experiences and expertise of the practitioners responsible for teaching writing, not the tenured faculty who theorized about their work. Post-secondary writing instructors and teaching assistants were positioned in the resolution as the experts who should be consulted to determine the standards and expectations for salary, working conditions, and benefits (McDonald & Schell, 2011;

238

Robertson, Crowley & Lentricchia, 1987; Sledd, 1991). The resolution as a grassroots practitioner-led effort became a powerful testament to what was possible when people came together to voice their experiences and to determine collectively how to transform their material circumstances. Gunner (1993) argues that, in this regard, the Wyoming Resolution achieved three important things. It forced the field to confront its labor problems, thus opening the doors for groups to form within CCCC that were charged with addressing these issues. It also opened a space for writing instructors across the different sectors of education to build solidarity and a movement with each other through their shared struggles and visions for a more equitable working environment. Finally, it was the first resolution that formally declared teaching to be the primary focus and professional activity of writing instructors. Importantly, the resolution also exposed and attempted to reconcile what Kezar, DePaola, and Scott (2019) call the neoliberal "unbundling" of traditional faculty roles into discrete components. Within the neoliberal university, work previously done by each faculty member as part of their teaching responsibilities, including writing instruction, have become "unbundled" into discrete tasks assigned to different groups of workers in order to optimize efficiency. The Wyoming Resolution showed how key decisions that should have been made by instructional faculty, such as determining standards for their working conditions, had become the responsibility of faculty managers and administrators who had little connection to or understanding of contingent faculty members' daily responsibilities and experiences in the classroom. By demanding that instructional faculty have control over the critical decisions that directly impacted their work with students, the resolution attempted to rectify the labor abuses that the increasingly fragmented and stratified labor structures in writing programs had created.

Despite these successes and the promise the Wyoming Resolution seemed to hold for contingent postsecondary writing instructors, professional organizations' responses to the Wyoming Resolution instead contributed to the rising managerial emphasis in composition

programs in the years following the resolution. The CCCC "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing" in particular, which the CCCC Committee on Professional Standards for Quality Education wrote in the wake of the Wyoming Resolution and finalized in 1989, is widely regarded as having prioritized the economic interests and professional advancement of tenure track writing faculty and composition specialists over contingent, part-time faculty. Under the Wyoming Resolution, postsecondary writing instructors (including contingent faculty and part-time faculty) were supposed to develop the professional standards that would be used to determine the salary and working conditions for writing instructors (Schell, 1998). However, the CCCC Committee on Professional Standards issued their own statement on professional standards which argued that tenured faculty — not writing instructors — should be given the "responsibility for the academy's most serious mission, helping students to develop their critical powers as readers and writers" in order to ensure the "quality, integrity, and continuity of instruction and the principle of academic freedom" (CCCC Executive Committee, 1989, p. 330-335). They called for the creation of tenure-track lines in order to staff writing programs, recommending that programs with over 10 percent of contingent or part-time faculty should convert these to tenured positions, and that full-time, non-tenure-track instructors should be hired as these conversions took place (CCCC Executive Committee, 1989; McDonald & Schell, 2011; Schell, 1998). While these recommendations were framed as a way to "professionalize" academic writing programs and increase job security, the contingent faculty who had written and supported the Wyoming Resolution recognized that these proposed tenure lines and "professionalization" procedures were not intended for them and could result in the elimination of their jobs. The proposed tenure lines and processes for professionalizing writing programs were modeled after literature programs that prioritized research and publications over teaching "service learning" courses and thus left contingent faculty who specialized in teaching vulnerable to job loss (Gunner, as cited in McDonald &

240

Schell, 2011). Many rank-and-file writing instructors at the time believed that the theory-heavy research written by scholars with little experience teaching composition was not reflective of their work with students in the classroom (Sledd, 1991); yet, the statement's call for tenure-track lines to professionalize writing programs ultimately suggested that these research activities would be prioritized over teaching when it came time to convert adjunct positions to tenured positions. In suggesting that research, publications, and conference presentations were central to achieving the envisioned professionalization of the field and would demonstrate tenured faculty's "commitment to the teaching of writing" (Gunner, 1993), the statement undermined writing instructors' authority and expertise as practitioners and reinforced the existing hierarchies between contingent faculty and tenure-track faculty. To contingent faculty, the CCCC Statement created what they saw as the foundation for future opportunities to eliminate their jobs.

The CCCC Executive Committee's envisioned process for professionalizing writing programs was an early example of the increasingly stratified labor hierarchies that would come to characterize the reading and composition field. In this labor structure, tenure-track faculty with English or rhetoric and composition PhDs became WPAs who could decide how to train and "professionalize" writing faculty, determine working conditions for part-time and non-tenure track faculty, and set the curricular and programmatic goals of the department. Far from reflecting common interests between tenured faculty and contingent faculty as is often assumed in composition research (as evidenced, for instance, in Harris [2000]), the CCCC Statement and the Executive Committee members who drafted it transformed the Wyoming Resolution into what Gunner describes as a "bureaucratic, self-serving document" (as quoted in McDonald & Schell, p. 371). The statement not only ignored how contingent faculty wanted to define and address labor issues, but also refused to take up and institute the grievance and censure procedures that the original authors of the Wyoming Resolution had stipulated were critical for dismantling the exploitative labor system (Gunner, 1993, McDonald & Schell, 2011; Sledd,

1991). The statement's call for tenure lines as the solution for job security and labor issues undermined the important advances in professional standards for salary, benefits, and job security that part-time faculty at the California State University system had already won through collective bargaining (McDonald & Schell, 2011, p. 372), thus overlooking how contingent faculty were already defining their own professional standards and creating their own processes for transforming their working conditions. As the statement became the "reigning professional voice of composition and rhetoric" and gained power in the field by "claiming for itself the right to define the profession's prevailing interest and values" (Gunner, 1993, p. 59), it allowed WPAs and tenured faculty to structure writing programs and staffing according to the professional activities of tenure-track faculty. Labor systems in composition programs were restructured in ways that advanced WPAs' and tenured faculty's professional interests and trajectories while further unbundling research from teaching. However, these labor structures did little to help improve the working conditions or job security of the contingent instructors. The growing divisions between the two groups and their professional, labor, and economic trajectories reflected what Bousquet (2008), Slaughter and Leslie (1997), and Rhoades (1998) refer to as "academic capitalism" — the processes by which academic faculty are rewarded for competing with each other for resources, recognition, funding, status, and more as a result of being managed professionals (Rhoades, 1998). As they are forced to work within the parameters, budgets, and policies that have been set by managerial leadership, faculty become active and even willing participants in these stratified labor hierarchies (Bousquet, 2008; Rhoades, 1998) at the expense of working with each other for their mutual benefit and collective progress. As a result, the labor issues that writing faculty experienced and the ongoing problems they faced around the lack of autonomy and respect in their profession did not change after CCCC issued its statement (Gunner, 1993; Schell, 1998; Sledd, 1991). Many WPAs, composition researchers, and tenured faculty were able to advance their status, monetary compensation, and career trajectories, while

the exploitative labor conditions and issues of unequal professional status persisted for part-time and non-tenure-track faculty who taught basic writing. The so-called "revolution" (Sledd, 1991) that the Wyoming Resolution had promised failed as university administrators prioritized the rise of WPAs and paid little attention to the actual work and needs of contingent faculty.

Sledd (1991) and Gunner (1993) both attribute the eventual failure of the Wyoming Resolution to the threat its provisions posed to composition departments' existing labor systems. The document presented contingent instructors — non-tenure track, part-time, and graduate students — as the experts who would redefine the standards by which their work would be compensated, structured, and evaluated. These provisions, and especially the formal grievance and censure procedures for institutions that violated these new professional standards, posed viable threats to the "just in time" labor structure in English and composition programs. Hiring a flexible workforce whose numbers fluctuated according to student demand allowed writing programs to increase their economic efficiency within the neoliberal university, but allowing part-time faculty to institute new compensation structures and grievance procedures in response to exploitative working conditions threatened the market-based labor system. The CCCC Statement played an important role in eliminating the parts of the Wyoming Resolution that most threatened the existing labor and tenure structure in writing programs, which shifted attention and resources back to WPAs and tenured faculty. Sharon Crowley (1991), the former chair of the Committee on Professional Standards, later confirmed that the tenured committee members who instituted the changes had created standards that reflected their own definitions of professionalism, job security, and labor and composition standards rather than what the contingent writing faculty were demanding:

> Tenured academics have always dictated the terms of Freshman English teaching to its staff, and it is tenured academics who fight over its curriculum. And I am afraid that it was tenured academics who dictated the standards of professional instruction and who put limits on the implementation of the Wyoming Resolution. Which brings me to the

first lesson I learned from working with it: do not presume to speak for others who do not enjoy your privileges …" (p. 168)

Crowley's statement and the transformation of the Wyoming Resolution into the CCCC Statement is a critical reminder that relying on WPAs and tenured faculty to create structural change in writing programs and the field more generally has historically failed to serve part-time and non-tenure-track contingent writing instructors well. The managerial responsibilities that WPAs and tenured composition faculty assume often require carrying out tasks and directives that advance the ideological and economic goals of university management and that, as Bousquet (2004) maintains, simply do not align with the labor-based fights that part-time and non-tenure track faculty face. While they may be sympathetic to the struggles of contingent faculty, WPAs are responsible for managing and supervising composition instructors' labor and training in order to bring the research- and publication-based "professionalism" to the field that writing programs presumably lack. Their role as managers who oversee but who do not experience the daily realities or precarity of teaching as rank-and-file instructors within the economically efficient labor systems they manage often puts them at fundamental odds with the writing instructors themselves (Kahn, 2017). The tendency to elide the differences between WPAs and non-tenure track faculty by integrating them into the all-encompassing "we" or "our" problematically "imbues the ambition of the professional or managerial compositionist for respect and validity *with the same urgency* as the struggle of composition labor for wages, health care, and office space" (Bousquet, 2004, p. 16, emphasis added). As seen in the case of the Wyoming Resolution, the tendency to equate professionalization and programmatic change with research, tenure, and administrative initiatives often fails to address labor and pedagogical realities in ways that are relevant to non-tenure track instructors. According to Bousquet (2004), the work of "understanding this intimacy [between the presumed shared struggles of managers and instructors] as a structural relationship requires careful examination of the possibility that

244

the heroic narrative of disciplinary success for professional and managerial compositionists has depended in part on the continuing *failure* of the labor struggle" (Bousquet, 2004, p. 16).

Graduate student writing instructors' labor experiences also help to demonstrate why WPAs and rank-and-file instructors have struggled to reconcile their interests. As instructors who face similarly precarious and poorly compensated working conditions as part-time and contingent faculty, graduate student writing instructors played a central role in pushing post-secondary writing instructors to write the Wyoming Resolution. The CCCC Statement (1989) made a concerted effort to improve the working conditions of graduate students, acknowledging that "nearly all graduate students teaching writing in English departments are *de facto* instructors, fully in charge of their classes" and arguing that "their compensation, benefits, and work load (class size and course load) should be adjusted accordingly" (p. 62). Yet, given that the statement was meant to transform the field from one staffed by contingent and part-time instructors to one staffed by tenured research faculty, it is important to note that the executive committee decided to *retain* graduate students as an essential part of the writing program labor structure while part-time and non-tenure track instructors were meant to be replaced by tenured faculty eventually. While graduate students would, according to the statement, be compensated more fairly and given more manageable workloads, they would not be offered the professional compensation that the graduate student writing instructors and contingent instructors had stipulated, nor would they receive the same compensation or titles as their contingent, non-tenure-track colleagues despite teaching the same courses. According to the provisions of the statement, graduate students were to be given workloads that would not "interfere with their progress toward their degree" (p. 62), but the statement failed to address the fact that the graduate students who taught the same writing courses as their faculty colleagues would still be treated, classified, and compensated as *students* or as *future faculty-in-training* rather than as

245

professionals who were *already doing the work that they were presumably being trained to do.*[1] In this

sense, the graduate student writing instructors' real labor struggles — the fight to be granted the

same status and professional standards of compensation, benefits, and respect as their colleagues

— were ignored so administrators could continue using them to meet flexible labor needs.

Moreover, their real labor concerns were rewritten to fit the heroic WPA narrative. In this

narrative, the "benevolent WPA" (Strickland, 2004) (instead of the graduate students themselves)

fought for and won economic resources and workload limits (rather than appropriate academic

titles and equivalent compensation to reflect their real responsibilities) to support and meet the

needs and future careers of their graduate students (as defined by the executive committee). The

CCCC statement rewrote the actual demands of the graduate students, thus allowing WPAs not

only to fulfill larger administrative directives to staff courses with flexible and cheap labor, but

also to become the heroic WPAs who had successfully fought for and "won" moderately

improved compensation, workload, and resources for their graduate students. These "successes"

were possible and could only be viewed as "successes" because they denied graduate students

and contingent faculty the opportunity to maintain control over and win the fight for their real

labor demands and professional aspirations.

---

[1] Bousquet's (2008) research on the plight of graduate students as casualized workers is particularly important, as it makes visible the reality that graduate programs "admit students to fill specific labor needs" (p. 20) and thus become recruiting and training systems that "legitimate the employment of nondegreed students and faculty." Labor needs that go unfulfilled by graduate students are, according to Bousquet, met instead by contingent faculty (part-time and non-tenure track) rather than tenure-track faculty. As such, Bousquet argues that graduate student research and labor must be understood within the context of the increasingly flexible or contingent job market: "Under casualization, it makes very little sense to view the graduate student as potentially a 'product' for a 'market' in tenure-track jobs. For many graduate employees, the receipt of the Ph.D. signifies the end, and not the beginning, of a long teaching career. Most graduate students are already laboring at the only academic job they'll ever have … Increasingly, the holders of the doctoral degree are not so much the *products* of the graduate-employee labor system as its *by-products* …" (p. 21). Wright's (2017) analysis takes this further, illustrating that while graduate students may never hold the tenure track positions they are supposedly training for, their working conditions as writing instructors "teaching a 2/2 load of FYW with minimal training, no private office … a low salary, little chance of shared governance, little representation on department committees, and few benefits" (p. 277) are in fact training them to become *contingent faculty.* As such, their work and working conditions, which closely mirror those of contingent and part-time faculty, are an integral part of reinforcing the labor system that not only depends on part-time and contingent labor, but that also "eras[es] the material realities of graduate student labor" (p. 277) and their needs as student-workers by labeling their work as a form of "apprenticeship."

The Unanticipated Outcomes of Collective Bargaining: The University of California and the Managerial Logics of Teaching Excellence and Student Evaluations of Teaching

The turn to WPAs and administrators to drive change under the heroic WPA narrative may result in incremental, localized changes, but the Wyoming Resolution, CCCC Statement, and the subsequent Portland Resolution (a WPA-produced document explaining the responsibilities of WPAs) made clear that the resources and concessions that a WPA wins might never fully meet or align with the rank-and-file instructors' real demands and true ideological interests. As tenure-track faculty and WPAs increasingly become the voices and perceived leaders of labor-based progress and "creat[e] the impression that the work towards shared governance and contingent-faculty participation is the responsibility of tenured faculty, with contingent faculty the grateful recipients of their efforts" (Wootton & Moomau, 2017), contingent faculty have turned to collective bargaining and self-advocacy movements to change both their working conditions and the dominant narratives about how to institute change in writing program labor structures (Doe, Maisto & Adsit, 2017; Donhardt & Layden, 2017; Wootton & Moomau, 2017). The emergence of adjunct and non-tenure-track collective bargaining units that focus exclusively on fighting for the needs and interests of contingent faculty reflect one way that contingent faculty have managed to regain control over grievance procedures and contract negotiations (Schell, 1998). By forming collective bargaining units that are free from the influence of tenured faculty, contingent faculty have successfully created spaces where their expertise on their precarious working conditions is valued and where their needs are prioritized: their first-hand knowledge allows them to define and advocate for the professional standards that are essential for changing their precarious working conditions. Through these collective bargaining units, contingent faculty have shaped the professional standards by which their work is assessed, built

salary schedules to ensure compensation structures that reflect their experience and expertise, instituted review and grievance procedures, developed procedures for advancement and promotion, and created processes through which they can secure more stable employment. The advances contingent faculty have made in self-advocacy are not restricted to collective bargaining or contract negotiations: the formation of academic journals focused on labor justice in higher education such as *Workplace* and organizations such as the New Faculty Majority also offer important spaces for contingent faculty, graduate students, and allies to build relationships and community, generate critical analysis, and take collective action in other capacities. As contingent faculty and graduate students choose to name and challenge the practices that deny them professional status and that "co-opt the voice of labor" (Bousquet, 2004), they demonstrate a "committ[ment] not to the recognition of the inevitability of the corporate university but to struggling toward a different reality" (Bousquet, 2004, p. 19). In this new reality, collective power, rather than the heroic WPA, drives structural change. In this context, attempts to "organize and effect action" (Schell, 2004) through collective bargaining and the formation of labor-based, rank-and-file-run journals and organizing spaces can be seen as a direct response to the failures of the Wyoming Resolution and the subsequent CCCC and Portland statements. These efforts to grow rank-and-file collective power also respond to Lester Faigley's (1996) call to action in his CCCC Chair's Letter, in which he argued that, because of the fallout from the Wyoming Resolution, "we will have to do more than write statements … we need to form alliances with other organizations if we expect to address issues of working conditions in any substantial way" (p. 1).

Despite these gains, however, it has still proven difficult for contingent faculty to build the kinds of labor contracts and grievance procedures capable of fully bringing into being the new realities that Bousquet (2004) describes. Contingent faculty have been able to win better job security, compensation, benefits, and pedagogical autonomy through collective bargaining and

through their simultaneous efforts to organize collectively through unionization — gains whose significance should not be ignored, given the long history of how the academy has strategically used and exploited adjunct labor under the "just-in-time" labor model for economic and pedagogical efficiency. Yet, even these actions and gains are not immune to the logics of managerial oversight and control that contingent faculty are trying to dismantle. Eileen Schell's (1998) seminal analysis of contingent labor in writing programs, for instance, distinguishes between what she describes as "reformist solutions" (p. 99) that address the exploitation of contingent faculty by professionalizing working conditions, and "unionist/collectivist solutions" (p. 109) that rely on collective bargaining to improve working conditions. In Schell's study, surveys of writing programs indicate that department-led reform efforts commonly work to build professional writing instructorships that are full-time but non-tenure track. These full-time positions offer similar benefits, compensation, and evaluation processes as those given to tenure-track faculty, including equitable benefits and salaries, opportunities for professional development, merit-based pay increases, evaluations of the instructors' three-part teaching/research/service contributions, and eventual opportunities for longer-term appointments as they are promoted and gain seniority on the non-tenured track. The reform efforts clearly are meant to alleviate the precarious working situation of contingent faculty by offering relative stability through promotions and salary adjustments. They echo many of the victories that have also been won by instructors at other institutions such as the University of California, whose job protections, workload, and compensation structure are regarded as among the strongest in the nation for non-tenure track faculty (Samuels, 2013). Despite these important advances, however, participants in Schell's study criticize reform efforts for being overly dependent on the presence of supportive administrators, consistent funding and resources, institutional memory, and faculty who understand and are committed to realizing the larger visions behind these reform efforts. For many instructors, these reforms are unstable and lack long-term viability without the

249

presence of a consistently benevolent WPA or dean, thus precluding the possibility that they could ever become a permanent solution. Schell thus presents collective bargaining as a more stable solution, as the gains won and formalized in collective bargaining agreements and multi-year labor contracts are more likely to survive administrative turnover. In the cases of unions and bargaining teams comprised solely of adjunct and contingent faculty, collective bargaining processes and their resulting agreements directly reflect the voices of and work towards the professional and pedagogical interests of non-tenure track instructors. According to Rhoades (1998), collective bargaining and unions provide the kinds of formal agreements and contracts that are critical for creating "the balance between managerial discretion and professional control or constraint" so that faculty can begin to "control the terms of their labor" in ways that are not possible through department-led reform efforts (p. 11).

However, Rhoades (1998), Schell (1998), and Schell's study participants fail to account for the fact that the gains made through collective bargaining often can be similar to reformist solutions. Changes in hiring, benefits, compensation and COLA structures, access to resources, and the conversion of part-time to full-time positions are critical resources that improve the working conditions of contingent faculty and make it possible for them to have career appointments. Contingent faculty within the University of California (UC) system, for instance, were able to win negotiated salary increases through collective bargaining over an eighteen-year period that raised the minimum pay from $28,968 in 2000 to $54,736 in 2018, and in 2007 successfully negotiated provisions that gave lecturers the power to dispute and change the workload value of their courses to reflect the work they were actually expected to do (University Council-AFT, 2021). Both were critical steps towards ensuring UC lecturers would be compensated more fairly for their work and established procedures that not only gave lecturers more power to define what counted as work, but that also set standards for job protections and compensation structures for contingent faculty across the nation (Samuels, 2013). Yet, even

gains like the ones that the lecturers in the UC system won can still leave intact the labor hierarchies and managerial logics that contingent faculty want to eliminate and that structure reformist solutions. Managers and writing scholars such as Murphy (2000) present the reformist practice of hiring instructors in programs with full-time status, multi-year contracts, and competitive benefits and compensation packages as an innovative and forward-looking solution to labor problems in writing programs, but instructors have criticized these efforts (as seen in Schell, 1998) for their dependence on heroic WPAs and administrators to fund and maintain these practices over time. These solutions maintain precarious appointment structures that have been in place since the mid-1980s when changes to appointment structures shifted largely towards non-tenure track work (Bousquet, 2004). Contingent faculty have been able to win similar demands and changes in contract structures, appointment percentage, and compensation gains through rank-and-file organizing and collective bargaining. There is no question that these gains are critical, and indeed, necessary, for transforming the daily and long-term circumstances and experiences of adjunct and contingent faculty. Contingent faculty have been able to make lasting, material changes in their professional work when they lead collective bargaining efforts that center the issues that directly impact their daily working conditions, as evidenced by the major pay increases, workload reductions, and improved pathways to job security that UC lecturers in particular have won through collective bargaining efforts over the past twenty years (University Council-AFT, 2021). However, both the collective bargaining approach and the reformist managerial approach lead to the same outcome: a multi-year, full-time appointment status with salary and benefits *similar* to tenure-track faculty, but without the *equivalent* status, protections, or compensation of a tenure-track appointment. Bousquet (2004) warns against the danger of proposals and recommendations such as these that tend to "*idealize after the fact, legitimating an already existing reality that few people are pleased with*" (p. 22). The perceived short-term gains of reformist solutions even in collective bargaining run the risk of overlooking

and failing to address the real complexities of ongoing labor and job security issues that writing instructors face, with significant consequences for the instructors themselves.

The appointment structure for lecturers at the University of California can be used to illustrate the danger of mistaking collective bargaining outcomes as fundamentally different from managerial or reformist interests. The contingent faculty union at the University of California — the University Council-American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT) — and its lecturer-led bargaining unit (Unit 18) have won important job security provisions within their memorandum of understanding (MOU). In the Unit 18 MOU[2], lecturers who have worked at the university for less than six years (colloquially known as "pre-six lecturers" or "pre-continuing appointment lecturers") can be appointed to a quarter, semester, or academic year appointment, with the possibility of having an initial appointment duration of up to two academic years (Unit 18 MOU, 2020a, Article 7a, Section E, Paragraph 1). After successfully passing a performance assessment process that reviews lecturers' "competence in the field, ability in teaching, academic responsibility, and other assigned duties" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020a, Article 7a, Section E, Paragraph 1c), lecturers can be subsequently reappointed during their first six years of employment at the same UC campus for a period of up to three academic years (Unit 18 MOU, 2020a, Article 7a, Section F, Paragraph 2). Provisions within Article 7a and Article 31 of the MOU stipulate that pre-six lecturers be given a mandatory 6% salary increase once they are appointed for a fourth year of service (with the opportunity to be granted more than 6% at the discretion of the university) and have the opportunity to undergo a mentoring meeting for feedback. Importantly, these provisions also preclude the university from "churning" lecturers, which is the practice of failing to reappoint pre-six lecturers in order to replace them with a lecturer who would be compensated for teaching the same course at a lower salary in order to save money. During the

---

[2] All discussions of and references to the Unit 18 Non-Senate Faculty Memorandum of Understanding refer to the MOU effective February 27, 2016 through January 31, 2020.

academic year in which a lecturer will reach their 18th quarter, 12th semester, or 24th fiscal quarter of service in the same department, they undergo an excellence review, which lecturers colloquially know as the "sixth year review." In this review, lecturers are assessed according to the following criteria: "a) Command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new topics; b) ability to organize and present course materials; c) ability to awaken in students awareness of the importance of the subject matter; d) ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to do creative work; and e) achievements of students in their field" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section E, Paragraph 1). Lecturers who pass their excellence review are granted seniority (known as "continuing status" and given three-year appointments (known as "continuing appointments"). Every three years after achieving seniority, they undergo merit reviews which allow them to earn at least a 6% salary increase (Unit 18 MOU, 2020c, Article 22). The appointment, evaluation, merit, and seniority structures for the Unit 18 MOU are considered to be among the best in the nation for non-tenure track faculty because they offer a clear path to continuing appointment, job security, and merit-based salary adjustments. They are the result of over 35 years of collective bargaining and organizing led by the rank-and-file lecturers and have been cited as examples for how the federal government could begin to address the exploitative contingent labor system in higher education (Samuels, 2013).

The protections that UC-AFT Unit 18 lecturers have won through collective bargaining offer critical improvements to and serve as an important alternative to the typical appointment structure for adjunct and contingent faculty in the U.S. Whereas most adjuncts in the U.S. are given no benefits, no path to continuing appointment or merit increases, and are compensated only $3,000 per course, the Unit 18 bargaining unit has fought to ensure their rank-and-file instructors have the resources and job protections to build a full career as a lecturer in the UC system. Many UC lecturers become what are colloquially known as "career" lecturers thanks to

collective bargaining — lecturers who, despite their contingent status, are compensated well enough for full-time work and given pathways to enough job security that they can teach in these positions as their primary or sole job and retire after a full career with a pension and benefits. Yet, lecturers often discuss the MOU's gains without paying sufficient attention to the managerial logics that structure the document. These managerial stipulations threaten to undermine many of the protections the lecturers have won, giving university management just enough flexibility to retain significant control over what seems to be a lecturer-centered agreement. Two key concepts in the document in particular — "instructional need" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section C) and "teaching excellence" — create the conditions needed to maintain the flexible workforce pool that will meet the business and market needs of the neoliberal university. As is the case at other two-year and four-year colleges and universities, lecturers' appointments within the UC system depend on instructional need, which is determined by student enrollment in courses. In university writing programs where student enrollment fluctuates depending on how students fare on placement exams or other course placement metrics, pre-six lecturers who have been hired for a full academic year still live with the uncertainty of whether they will have work the following semester. Campus budget procedures also exacerbate this uncertainty: because lecturer salaries are tied to Temporary Academic and Staff (TAS) budgets at each campus, which are finalized only at the end of the academic year, departments and programs cannot hire and rehire lecturers with sufficient advanced notice (Burawoy & Johnson-Hanks, 2018, p. 12). As such, even with the existing seniority and right to reemployment protections within the Unit 18 MOU, UC lecturers still work within the "just-in-time" labor model, with over 50% of lecturers at UC Berkeley in 2016 given less than one semester's notice about their reappointment for the following semester and 10% of those lecturers given less than one month's notice (Burawoy & Johnson-Hanks, 2018, p. 12). Given these unstable working conditions, Unit 18 lecturers are thus eligible to collect

unemployment over the summer and during holiday breaks between quarters or semesters, with the legal basis for their eligibility to do so based on the *Cervisi vs Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board* decision (1989), which ruled that appointments "contingent on adequate enrollment, funding, and the approval of the District's Board of Governors" were not "'reasonable assurance' of continued employment." The number of unemployment resources available on UC-AFT's website (2020), including unemployment guides, sample appeal letters and briefs, and examples of how to answer questions in unemployment interviews, indicate that, despite the perceived stability of the appointment and compensation structure, pre-six lecturers still struggle with precarious employment. During their most recent efforts to negotiate a new contract in 2019 and 2020, the Unit 18 bargaining team has made it a priority to enhance lecturer appointment stability in order to address the existing weaknesses around appointment length in their MOU; yet, these efforts have not led to the stability needed to shift power from administrators to lecturers. While the Unit 18 bargaining proposal as of February 2020 is for a 1-2-3 contract (McIver, 2020), which would mean that pre-six lecturers would be hired for 1-year, 2-year, or 3-year appointments during their first six years of employment, this proposal does not necessarily change the fact that appointments in the MOU would still be contingent on instructional need, adequate financial resources, and stable program or department course structures. As the Unit 18 bargaining team even makes clear in their own analysis, most departments and programs within the UC system continue to hire lecturers on a semester-to-semester or year-to-year basis despite their ability to offer two-year appointments under the current MOU (UC-AFT Faculty Bargaining Update and FAQ, 2020). This essentially renders the successful implementation of a 1-2-3 proposal for pre-six lecturers useless unless there are corresponding changes to the MOU's instructional need clauses or the guaranteed presence of a heroic WPA in every department willing to commit to hiring lecturers according to a 1-2-3 appointment structure regardless of anticipated instructional need.

For lecturers approaching their excellence review, administrative and managerial control over the definitions of instructional need is even more visible in Article 7b (2020b) of the MOU, which details how workers in other appointment categories who are qualified to teach the same courses as a lecturer may be hired for these positions over a lecturer. This process offers administrators a way to avoid having to grant new continuing appointments in the department. The article states that there is no instructional need for a continuing appointment if senate faculty, graduate academic student employees, distinguished visiting professors, or adjunct professors (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b Article 7b, Section C, Paragraph 2a-d) are assigned to teach the courses that would have otherwise gone to a lecturer, or if there is a departmental need for "intellectual diversity." The list of job title classifications is particularly troubling, as there are no outlined procedures for determining these individuals' qualifications other than those for graduate academic student employees, who must either have training in the same department or a related discipline, or who can be assigned to teach a course as part of their "academic plan for pedagogical training" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section C, Paragraph 2b). Bousquet's (2008) and Sledd's (1991) analyses of how graduate student labor fulfills multiple needs at the university help to explain just how precarious the Unit 18 lecturers' positions are under the stipulations of Article 7b. Bousquet's (2008) work illustrates that graduate students fulfill critical labor needs in the university and thus serve as the foundation for the university's stratified labor hierarchy: contingent faculty are only brought in to meet the labor needs that graduate students are unable to meet. According to Sledd (1991), graduate student labor is also structured to free tenure-track faculty from having to teach these classes. Graduate students who are hired to teach service courses like reading and composition thus allow tenure-track faculty to focus on teaching graduate courses, which are in turn filled by the graduate student employees who are able to pay tuition and take those graduate courses because of their teaching assignments (Sledd, 1991). While hiring contingent faculty to teach these courses would also allow senate faculty to teach

graduate seminars, adjuncts do not fill graduate seminars with graduate students, nor do they provide graduate research assistants to support faculty research projects. In the case of the UC system, the Unit 18 MOU formalizes this hierarchy and labor structure by allowing programs to hire graduate students into positions formerly or potentially held by lecturers for "pedagogical training" purposes. This move allows any graduate student without content expertise but who presumably needs pedagogical training to replace a pre-six lecturer who has both content-level expertise and at least five years of relevant, discipline-specific pedagogical experience.

These MOU weaknesses are further compounded by the MOU's focus on "teaching excellence," which drives much of the content of collective bargaining. "Teaching excellence" is a core component of the assessment and evaluation process for both pre-six lecturers and lecturers with continuing appointment. Lecturers undergoing their sixth-year review are evaluated according to their ability to demonstrate excellence in their field, teaching, and academic and departmental responsibilities (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section E), with particular attention paid to evidence demonstrating their excellence in instructional performance. They are expected to show excellence in teaching through their "a) command of the subject matter and continuing growth in mastering new topics; b) ability to organize and present course materials; c) ability to awaken in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter; d) ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to do creative work; and e) achievements of students in their field" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section E, Paragraph 1a-e). A wide range of relevant materials may be considered in these excellence reviews, including student evaluations, assessments of former students who have demonstrated professional success, assessments by faculty members, the development of innovative instructional methods and materials, and peer assessments of classroom visits. While the evaluation criteria for instructional performance seems to offer a clear set of skills that lecturers should be able to showcase in their sixth year portfolios, the MOU specifically focuses

on evaluating lecturers' demonstrated *excellence* in their work, thus making evaluation procedures more complicated. Bill Readings's (1996) research on excellence in higher education illustrates that while people generally agree on the importance of excellence in universities, the criteria by which universities define or judge excellence is in fact completely arbitrary: the non-referential nature of excellence means that its meaning is always determined by the individual person using it and the unique criteria they use to fill it with meaning (Readings, 1996, p. 24-25). While universities increasingly use the notion of excellence to describe their teaching, research, learning, and service activities (Readings, 1996, p. 28-29), Readings argues that these logics problematically combine dissimilar functions and activities under a generalized, all-encompassing label. Excellence in research is not necessarily the same as excellence in teaching or learning; yet, educators tend to overlook the differences in both the type of activity and the criteria they use to judge these activities when they apply the notion of excellence in their assessments universally. The widely accepted and rarely questioned notion and logics of excellence allow educators to use this term to describe vastly different activities, even if there is no consistency in what it actually means across different contexts. The flexibility of excellence, which can be seen through its capacity to be defined differently by each individual with their individual standards of judgment, "allows the combination on a single scale of … utterly heterogeneous features" and thus allows for the "a priori exclusion of all referential issues, that is, any questions about what excellence in the University might *be*, what the term might *mean*" (Readings, 1996, p. 27). According to Readings, giving weight to the arbitrary categories and activities that purportedly give "meaning" to and allow educators to "measure" excellence without first evaluating their legitimacy (p. 25) suggests that excellence prioritizes accounting and "demonstrat[ing] accountability using the logics of capitalism and business in order to measure performance" (p. 25). Within this context, educators no longer have to prioritize cultivating meaningful ideological, cultural, or community interests within and beyond the university (p. 42). Instead, the

258

vacuousness and non-referentiality of excellence "actually works to hide the connections to practice that are concerned only with competition, allowing academic programs that have embraced market logic to paint themselves as student-centered" (Wright, 2017, p. 273).

In the case of Unit 18 lecturers within the UC system, Readings's (1996) concerns with using the non-referential logics of excellence to measure instructional quality raise questions about the criteria used to evaluate lecturers' work with students. The listed evaluation criteria for teaching excellence are clearly relevant and foundational to the work of teaching, including instructors' ability to organize and present course materials, to help students become curious learners who understand the importance of the topics they are studying, and to demonstrate their mastery over existing and new subject material. However, these criteria do not necessarily help lecturers understand what distinguishes *adequate* or *strong* evidence of these qualities in their teaching from *excellence* in their teaching performance. The listed qualities, in other words, indicate baseline skills lecturers need to demonstrate when teaching, but showing one's "ability to awaken in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section E, Paragraph 1c) does not offer clarity as to *how* department administrators and managers evaluate or measure excellence in lecturers' ability to foster these forms of awareness and understanding. Articulating the *kinds* of instructional qualities that managers will review in lecturers' performance review materials is not the same as articulating the *criteria and standards for determining sustained excellence in the work of a lecturer who demonstrates these instructional qualities.* Yet, the two are regularly mixed up with one another. Document check-sheets provided by UC Berkeley's Academic Personnel Office (2018) for department managers and administrators who oversee excellence and merit reviews indicate that each department chair's recommendations must report on and analyze lecturers' instructional performance using the same criteria listed in Article 7b, Section E, Paragraph 1a-e of the MOU (e.g., command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new topics, ability to organize and present

course materials, etc.). Like the MOU, the Academic Personnel Office also provides a checklist of relevant materials that may be included in a lecturer's review materials to demonstrate evidence of teaching excellence, including student evaluations, assessments by former students, assessments by faculty colleagues, materials indicating the development of innovative teaching techniques, and peer classroom observation assessments (UC Berkeley Academic Personnel Office, 2018; Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section F, Paragraph 2a-e). Yet, the checklist offers no explanation as to how the department chairs are supposed to determine whether lecturers' materials demonstrate evidence of excellence in instructional performance. The absence of a clear standard of judgment and articulated criteria by which to measure or determine the presence of teaching excellence (as opposed to, for instance, teaching adequacy) is no mistake: the MOU explicitly states that in the event of procedural violations of the process for initial continuing appointment as outlined in Article 7b, "an Arbitrator shall not have the authority to substitute her/his judgment for the University's judgment with respect to instructional need, academic qualifications or determinations of excellence or non-excellence and thereby compel the University to make or continue an appointment" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section G, Paragraph 2). Without the power to dispute or define any of the criteria or definitions upon which their working conditions and job security actually depend (including definitions of instructional need, academic qualifications, and teaching excellence), lecturers can only file grievances to dispute *procedural* violations that may have had a "material adverse impact on the review results" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section G, Paragraph 3). If lecturers decide to dispute flaws in the performance review process that violate the evaluation procedures outlined in the MOU, administrators must re-do the performance review process, but are not required to reevaluate or make transparent the evaluation criteria or definitions they use to assess a lecturer's academic qualifications, teaching excellence, or instructional performance. While collective bargaining offers lecturers the opportunity to fight for the language, procedures, and

criteria that will best serve their needs and interests, one of the many weaknesses of the process, as Readings (1996) warns, is that "*excellence is invoked here, as always, to say precisely nothing at all*: it deflects attention away from the questions of what quality and pertinence might be, who actually are the judges of a relevant or a good University, and by what authority they become those judges" (p. 32, emphasis added). Under the protection of the Grievability and Arbitrability sections of Article 7a (Pre-Six Appointment and Reappointment), Article 7b (Process for Achieving Continuing Status and Continuing Appointments), Article 7c (Continuing Appointments), Article 17 (Layoff, Reduction in Time and Reemployment), and Article 22 (Merit Review), UC administrators in fact have the authority to define unilaterally instructional need, academic qualifications, and excellence as they see fit. They thus retain significant flexibility and control over every aspect of the reappointment and review process, and by extension, the working conditions and job security for pre-six and continuing lecturers, in what seems on the surface to be a transparent and lecturer-centered MOU.

Because of the uncertainty that the MOU's interest in teaching excellence creates for lecturers, pre-six lecturers have had to figure out on their own the actual, unwritten criteria and standards of judgment that administrators use to assess the quality of their instructional performance and their eligibility for continuing appointment. Although Unit 18 lecturers are required to submit different types of materials in their excellence files to the university to explain their own teaching performance and pedagogical objectives (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section F), lecturers have learned to pay particular attention to their student evaluations, which are unofficially considered the most significant portion of their excellence files (Burawoy & Johnson-Hanks, 2018). There is no official documentation in the MOU or in publicly available files posted on the University of California's or individual campus' Academic Personnel Office websites that confirms that student evaluations are the most heavily weighted component of a lecturer's excellence file (University of California Office of the President, 2020a). Yet, it is

important to note that within the UC Berkeley Excellence Review checklist (UC Berkeley Academic Personnel Office, 2018), student evaluations are the only evidence of teaching excellence for which the Academic Personnel Office has included additional directions about the type of information that lecturers must include with each set of evaluations. Lecturers must include with their student evaluations a summary table that lists all classes taught, semester and title, enrollment, mean effectiveness ratings (e.g., mean *teaching* effectiveness rating), and department averages (p. 1-2). Notably, Article 7b of the MOU does not include any of these details about the type of quantitative data the administration looks for. Although Article 7b states explicitly that the university cannot use the quantitative measure in student evaluations as the "sole criterion for evaluating teaching excellence" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section F, Paragraph 2a), the way this section of the MOU has been worded offers the administration and department chairs wide flexibility in how they choose to interpret this. The MOU states that "all relevant materials shall be given *due consideration*" (Unit 18 MOU, 2020b, Article 7b, Section F, emphasis added). This *suggests* that administrators should consider all materials equally during the evaluation process, but there are no provisions in the MOU that state explicitly or mandate that they must do so: administrators are only required to give relevant materials "due consideration," but still have the discretion to base their final decision about a lecturer's teaching excellence solely or largely on the student evaluations presented in the file. Similarly, the quantitative measures detailed in the UC Berkeley Academic Personnel Office excellence review check-sheet cannot be the "sole criterion for evaluating teaching excellence," but the wording of the MOU does not preclude administrators from using student evaluation data as the most heavily weighted criteria when they issue their final recommendations. They only need to prove, should there be a grievance regarding procedural flaws, that they have given all relevant materials "due consideration."

Lecturers are acutely aware that the MOU's language makes it possible for their excellence reviews to hinge solely on their student evaluations. Of particular concern are the quantitative measures the UC system uses to assess their teaching excellence, including their mean teaching effectiveness rating and their averages in relation to the department averages. Burawoy and Johnson-Hanks's (2018) survey of UC Berkeley lecturers reveals that, of the participants surveyed, 92% of those undergoing excellence reviews were required to submit quantitative scores, 91.4% were required to include qualitative evaluations, and 84.7% were required to include assessments of their course syllabi. Only 55.2% of those undergoing excellence reviews, however, were required to undergo and submit evidence of classroom observations, and only 63.2% needed to submit publications. The significant weight placed on student evaluations for the excellence review is not lost on lecturers. Questions asking students to rate faculty members' overall teaching effectiveness have been included in UC Berkeley's Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) forms since 1975 (Stark & Freishtat, 2014). The current SET teaching effectiveness question reads as follows: "Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?" (Stark & Freishtat, 2014, p. 2). Students are asked to choose a number from 1 (not at all effective) to 7 (extremely effective) that reflects their assessment of the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness, and the average score each faculty member earns for this question is thought to reflect their degree of teaching excellence. UC Berkeley lecturers' responses to qualitative survey questions in Burawoy and Johnson-Hanks's (2018) study revealed that they associated the lack of job security in Unit 18 with student evaluations and the SET teaching effectiveness question in particular. They attributed their unwillingness to take risks in their teaching to the weight placed on student evaluations during the review process: in practice, adopting new pedagogical approaches could negatively impact their student evaluation scores and thus pose a risk to their job security. One lecturer, for instance, describes their experiences

263

with student evaluations and teaching as follows: "I love teaching, but I don't feel like I can give it my all because I feel caught between a rock (students & student evaluations) and a hard place (department). The insecurity of the job I think seriously undermines my ability to be creative and to be innovative in the classroom. I stick to old methods of teaching that I know have worked well in the past, but I am way too afraid to try new things … [S]tudents are pretty brutal. Given how much role student evaluations play in reappointment decisions, this is a very tough place to be for a teacher. Especially a woman teacher" (Burawoy & Johnson-Hanks, 2018, p. 19). Other lecturers' qualitative responses in Burawoy and Johnson-Hanks's (2018) study echo these concerns and offer insight into their departments' standards for teaching effectiveness evaluation scores:

> Given the job insecurity of lecturers, I feel like a few angry students could make me lose my job because I know how much weight is put on the student evaluations and angry students who put "1"s [out of 7] have a larger impact on my ability to get a "6" [out of 7] on overall teaching effectiveness. The stress and anxiety that this creates for me frequently makes me want to quit my job. Research has shown the gender bias in these evaluations, and yet they continue to be used (and as a major component of assessing teaching excellence). This is gender discrimination at play. While other evidence of teaching excellence is allowed to be included in the reviews, I have been told by my department and my colleagues who have been teaching for longer that it all boils down to getting at least a "6" [out of 7] on overall teaching effectiveness. (Burawoy & Hanks-Johnson, 2018, p. 19)

Student evaluations and quantitative data have commonly been used as a proxy for teaching effectiveness and quality, and the limitations of doing so have been well documented (Pounder, 2007). Yet, Stark and Freishtat's (2014) analysis reveals that UC Berkeley continues to use SETs to measure teaching effectiveness despite extensive documentation that these forms of evaluation and interpretation are deeply flawed. Their work reveals how the ongoing use of quantitative measures to assess teaching excellence at UC Berkeley are particularly problematic for lecturers, whose MOU legally allows administrators to determine their reappointments based on quantitative data alone. According to Stark and Freishtat, administrators who assess student evaluations and average scores frequently fail to account for response rates, which directly

impacts the reliability of any class average. In cases where instructors are required to explain low response rates, this places indirect blame on the instructor rather than accounting for other factors beyond the instructor's control that may have affected both attendance and response rates. They argue that these failures to consider quantitative measures in their appropriate structural contexts are further compounded by administrators' habit of comparing instructors' average scores to departmental averages, which is a practice that operates under a number of false assumptions. These include assuming that the numbers and labels on the evaluations mean the same things to all students who fill out evaluations, and that the same numerical average for the overall teaching effectiveness question across two different sets of evaluations for two different instructors are equivalent regardless of the actual distribution of scores for each instructor. This practice also assumes that it is possible take the average of ordinal categorical variables that use numbers as labels, and that the "average" of numerical labels for an ordinal categorical actually means something. In this sense, administrators' common practices for using and interpreting averages in student evaluations of overall teaching effectiveness fail to account for basic problems in measurement and also fail to use, interpret, and contextualize properly the type of data they have collected. The data collected may be highly reliable, as it captures whether different students rate instructors similarly and whether students would continue to evaluate the instructor in the same way over time (Stark & Freishtat, 2014, p. 10). But, according to Stark and Freishtat, the real problem for instructors is that administrators often assume incorrectly that an instrument's reliability and inter-rater reliability means that the instrument itself (the student evaluation of teaching) is appropriate for measuring teaching effectiveness. As they are currently designed, SETs accurately measure "what students say" (p. 9) and what they observe in the classroom, which is not equivalent to measuring teaching effectiveness. Stark and Freishtat maintain that a more useful way to examine teaching effectiveness is to measure learning via student performance in subsequent courses as well as students' later career success (though this

assumes that it is possible to measure how much an individual course or instructor has contributed to student performance and career success). Yet, their review of the literature shows that in controlled, randomized experiments where subsequent student academic performance and career success are used as proxies for measuring teaching effectiveness, teaching effectiveness is negatively associated with SET scores (p. 12). In this context, then, the concerns that Unit 18 lecturers express about the heavy weight administrators place on SET scores to make reappointment decisions are not unfounded: lecturers are regularly evaluated for reappointment, promotion, and merit increases according to flawed definitions of teaching excellence and through flawed interpretive practices and instruments that have been discredited by statisticians. Despite clear evidence that these instruments do not actually measure what administrators claim they do, administrators and managers continue to use them to make reappointment and promotion decisions that shape lecturers' careers and livelihoods as well as student experiences in the classroom.

Stark and Freishtat (2014) maintain that because teaching evaluations have little to do with teaching excellence, it is more important to observe instructors' actual teaching practices and the course materials they have designed to facilitate student learning. To them, documentation of students' work, instructors' teaching and mentoring philosophies, testimonials from former students, job placements of former students and graduate students, and more all offer far more insight into what an instructor does to support student learning than the quantitative instruments administrators regularly misuse (p. 14). Their recommendations and analysis of composite sample chair's letters for merit and promotion cases in the UC Berkeley Department of Statistics suggest that when administrators begin looking at different types of materials to evaluate teaching, then it is possible to move away from the flawed practice of using one instrument to measure and quantify the quality of an instructor's teaching. The practice of looking at different materials forces administrators to ask different types of questions about an

instructor's teaching practices. Rather than asking whether or not an instructor demonstrates teaching excellence and verifying this through SET scores, administrators can focus on discerning how instructors engage with students and build their teaching practices, philosophies, and curricula over time and contexts. For example, department chairs who have observed instructors' classes via webcast or through recurring observations throughout the semester are able to comment on how instructors elicit student engagement and critical thinking during lectures and how they respond to student questions and understanding of the material over time. These discussions about classroom pedagogy can be contextualized alongside analysis of how the instructor's teaching materials contribute to the field and to pedagogical outcomes. This opens opportunities for administrators to engage in a situated review process that uses observation and the triangulation of many different teaching materials to expand their understanding of how instructors work with and support students in multiple contexts and with a range of different tools and approaches. In these contexts, classroom pedagogy can be seen as an evolving and multi-faceted process rather than a quantifiable product. Their efforts model how the careful and thoughtful assessments of teaching materials as well as a willingness to engage in regular observations of teaching to understand an instructor's pedagogical approach can shift the outcome and utility of the excellence review.

Digital Measures: The Master Narrative of Teaching Excellence Evaluation Indicators and Frameworks

Following the publication of Stark and Freishtat's (2014) article, there has been more pressure for administrators to examine a wide range of teaching materials during the excellence review process. Lecturers and contingent faculty who work predominately with students of color and who focus on race, racial inequities, and social justice in their classes have benefitted from this, as the focus on qualitative analysis allows them to present more fully the complexity of their

pedagogical work and to control the narrative of their work. For Unit 18 lecturers within the UC system, the push for department chairs to require and give serious consideration to qualitative materials in the review process aligns with existing provisions that the lecturers previously won in collective bargaining. This has opened opportunities for them to benefit from sections of the MOU that historically have been ignored. The Unit 18 MOU already offers instructors a wide range of possible materials to include in their portfolios, including self-statements and self-evaluations of their teaching goals and instructional performance, letters of assessment from former students and faculty colleagues, original instructional materials that showcase their instructional methods and innovations in teaching methods, and assessments of classroom observations by faculty colleagues (Unit 18 MOU, 2020, Article 7b, Section F). Faculty thus have the opportunity to use these materials to discuss their work with students of color in ways that are not visible from quantitative scores. They can share their teaching philosophies for working with multilingual and underrepresented students, showcase instructional and programming initiatives they have developed to support students of color, and explain how their work with students and within the department aligns with university equity and inclusion initiatives. At UC Merced, writing program lecturers undergoing excellence reviews are required to submit extensive documentation of their pedagogical work and philosophies such as lesson plans, course syllabi, sets of student work, and class visit reports from their colleagues. Moreover, they are also required to provide an accompanying set of annotations and narratives alongside their teaching materials that explain their rationale for course and activity design and how their teaching promotes student learning (UC Merced Merritt Writing Program Academic Review Committee, 2019). Within the comprehensive annotations and narratives they are required to include in their excellence review portfolios, lecturers have the opportunity to detail *how* to understand and read their materials in the context of student learning and pedagogical practice. They thus have extensive space to explain how they have intentionally designed and sequenced

their lessons, writing activities, and feedback to address students of color's specific needs and to shift their pedagogical methods over time and contexts.[3] When instructors have the opportunity to include qualitative materials and accompanying narratives as the foundation of their excellence review portfolios, both instructors and administrators who work with students of color have opportunities to move beyond the flawed premises and administrative logics of quantitative measures for teaching excellence. For instructors who are heavily involved in equity and inclusion initiatives both at the curricular, classroom, departmental, and university levels, Stark and Freishtat's (2014) UC-specific analysis offers the promise that their contributions to these initiatives will not be ignored. Their work gives the Unit 18 bargaining team clear evidence specific to the UC system that current evaluation procedures fail to follow basic principles of design and measurement in statistics, which the bargaining team can leverage to change the ambiguous language of evaluation in the MOU and to secure the resources and job security lecturers need.

Despite these advances and the ways that Stark and Freishtat's (2014) recommendations have encouraged department chairs to reevaluate excellence review procedures and assessment processes, it is still important to recognize that instructors' work with students of color is multi-faceted and complex and often cannot be captured fully with the qualitative forms of teaching

---

[3] Writing program lecturers at UC Merced undergoing their sixth year excellence review are required to submit the following materials: a self-statement that contextualizes the lecturer's pedagogical practice and the contents of their portfolio within the context of student learning; a c.v. that documents their educational, professional, and instructional activities and contributions; a bio-bibliography that includes an annotated course syllabus that closely documents a step-by-step rationale for designing their course as they have done; student evaluations with an accompanying narrative discussing key trends and findings from the evaluation results; a heavily annotated writing activity artifact (such as a set of discussion questions, a writing prompt, or a descriptive assignment rubric) that explains the pedagogical rationale for this activity as well as instructional scaffolding and sequencing for this activity and/or unit; an annotated lesson plan for the full day of instruction when the lecturer used the writing activity artifact in class, explaining how the lecturer taught the course and their rationale; multiple drafts of the work of two students (one "high achieving" student and one "low achieving" student) that includes original instructor feedback for the student, as well as annotations documenting how students demonstrated course learning outcomes and how instructor feedback shaped student learning and promoted students' ability to demonstrate learning outcomes; reports written by colleagues who observed the lecturer's class; and optional teaching journals and letters of reference from former students or current faculty colleagues (UC Merced Merritt Writing Program Academic Review Committee, 2019).

assessment listed in the Unit 18 MOU. Including additional materials in teaching portfolios such as classroom observations and the space for instructors to contextualize their work does not necessarily change underlying structural problems with the assessment criteria itself. As Maria del Carmen Salazar's (2018) research demonstrates, the real problems with most teaching evaluation procedures are in their underlying assumption that all instructors use a set of generally agreed-upon pedagogical skills and forms of knowledge that purportedly foster effective learning and engagement in any classroom or for any group of students. These assumptions obscure the real needs and work of both instructors and students of color.

The assumption that there is a "general consensus about what it is that teachers and teacher candidates should know and be able to do" (Cochran-Smith, 2020, p. 202, as quoted in Carmen Salazar, 2018, p. 467) encourages administrators to generate lists of instructional qualities such as those found in the Unit 18 MOU which they can then use to assess the work of all instructors across all contexts, institutions, departments, and courses. A comparison between the instructional qualities listed in Article 7b of the MOU and the generic instructional skills reflected in most teaching evaluation criteria (Carmen Salazar, 2018) shows that both lists focus on instructors' knowledge base, their ability to support students' application of and ongoing mastery of skills and content, their ability to engage students, and their ability to modify their teaching approaches and feedback. Within a generalized teaching assessment framework, universally effective instruction entails "(a) understanding content concepts; (b) connecting content to prior knowledge and experiences; (c) scaffolding learning; (d) facilitating standards- and outcome-based instruction; (e) providing students with opportunities to apply knowledge and master content; (f) assessing student learning, making instructional assignments, and supporting students in monitoring their own learning; g) giving explicit feedback; and (h) managing student behavior and classroom routines" (Carmen Salazar, 2018, p. 467). These approaches to teaching are extremely useful in many situations and are general enough to

capture the important work that many instructors do with their students, but Carmen Salazar (2018) argues that these teaching criteria and qualities operate under the false premise that all students benefit from learning under the same pedagogical approaches. Such frameworks do not consider how these teaching pedagogies might reinforce dominant cultural interests at the expense of students of color. Because the frameworks focus on universal applicability and general consensus, they default to endorsing teaching methods that prioritize notions of equal access within the existing structure of the education system rather than evaluating instructional methods that situate teaching and learning in their larger sociopolitical contexts in order to challenge systemic racial injustices in education. Her critique of the Danielson Framework, for example, which is commonly used to evaluate effective teaching among K-12 teachers, stems from the framework's advertised applicability across all grade levels, subjects, and contexts and from its failure to include culturally relevant indicators of effective teaching. The framework names pedagogical approaches that all presumably effective instructors use, such as turn-taking or ways of showing respect in the classroom, and presents these approaches as neutral or objective when in fact they are culturally constructed and engage students using methods based on western values. Carmen Salazar argues that this approach consistently ignores and suppresses the experiences and backgrounds of students of color while also ensuring that their expertise and ways of knowing and doing are never recognized within the "master narrative" of what "counts" as effective teaching methods and evaluation frameworks. When considering that "of [the Danielson framework's] four domains, 22 components, and 76 elements, only one element and indicator explicitly address the needs of marginalized youth" (p. 468), it is clear that the presumed neutrality or universal applicability of the evaluation framework reproduces structural inequities by largely ignoring the needs of students of color. The framework includes instructor knowledge of student cultural heritage and rewards instructors for creating spaces for families to share their heritage in classes, but Carmen Salazar criticizes these indicators of effective teaching

271

as insufficient because they fail to create changes in classroom pedagogy specifically designed to support students of color.

Vanessa Siddle Walker (1992) similarly documents the failures of generic classroom pedagogy and the difficulty of using them to address the learning experiences and needs of Black students. She argues, for instance, that the process models that instructors commonly use in middle and high schools for writing and literacy instruction prioritize methodological approaches that emphasize *how* to teach, including the steps and sequences for introducing concepts, scaffolding the writing and drafting process, facilitating large and small group discussion and collaboration, and responding to student written work. However, these process models overlook what Siddle Walker calls the "affective domain of English teaching" (p. 322), which attends to differing expectations and assumptions among students of color and instructors about what constitutes effective forms of teaching, learning, and interaction in the writing classroom. Siddle Walker finds that although Black students value instructors who set high expectations, who demonstrate their ability to take charge of the classroom, and who make learning interesting and enjoyable even as they maintain high expectations of students (p. 324), most instructors do not share these understandings about learning. Their instructional methods, including well-regarded teaching methods like question-posing and offering recommendations instead of directive feedback, are often antithetical to Black students' expectations and ways of engaging in the classroom. These differing assumptions about what counts as good teaching thus negatively affect students' performance in writing classes. Siddle Walker describes process-based and presumably neutral multicultural teaching approaches as ones that "could be construed by African-American students as efforts to minimize rather than increase their learning" (p. 323) and argues that Black students will continue to be at a disadvantage if instructors insist on perfecting these methodologies with little attention to or respect for what counts as learning or engagement for the students themselves. Even if instructors adopt the

272

kinds of multicultural and diversity-focused teaching approaches that are included in the Danielson Framework, these methods are insufficient because they do not address two key issues that Siddle Walker sees as central problems with most classroom pedagogies: instructors' ongoing lack of attention to the cultural definitions of learning that Black students bring to their work, and instructors' assumption that they can build relationships with and among students of color with little understanding of students' experiences or how students actually relate to and work with their peers. The elements and indicators of cultural heritage under the Danielson Framework, for instance, are presented as leading to suitable outcomes for *all students*, and in this sense, have not been designed to prioritize teaching pedagogies that instructors develop specifically to effect material changes in the lives and learning experiences of students of color. The framework's inclusion of cultural heritage as part of effective teaching thus aligns more closely with the rhetoric and outcomes of liberal multicultural approaches to teaching and learning: both seek to include diverse perspectives and experiences, but in ways that disproportionately benefit students who are already privileged. They do not necessarily reflect efforts to build pedagogies that emerge from and attend to the processes and definitions of what count as teaching and learning to students of color themselves, and thus rarely challenge dominant frameworks (Siddle Walker, 1992). According to Carmen Salazar (2018), universal indicators of good teaching practices facilitate the reproduction and maintenance of racial power structures in education under the guise of objectivity, neutrality, and additive diversity initiatives rather than addressing the specific learning needs, realities, and definitions of learning that students of color bring to the classroom. Despite the insistence that these indicators are universally beneficial for all students across all contexts, their pervasive use continues to put

students of color at a disadvantage as instructors reproduce a form of "teaching excellence" that

erases the particularities of their experiences within the current educational system.[4]

For Carmen Salazar (2018), the key to disrupting the dominant ideologies and power

structures within these universal criteria for effective teaching is to build evaluation instruments

that are conceptualized with critical race theory and culturally relevant pedagogy in mind.

Carmen Salazar moves away from the objective traditional teaching effectiveness indicators that

reproduce racially unjust pedagogical practices by "position[ing] the cultural, linguistic, and

familial resources of historically marginalized Communities of Color at the center of teaching

evaluation" (Carmen Salazar, 2018, p. 468). She develops teaching evaluation tools and

frameworks that highlight how instructors can reconceptualize instruction to empower students

of color and that require both instructors and administrators to confront the sociopolitical and

racial dimensions of education, knowledge formation, and pedagogical practice. To this end, the

new framework for evaluating teaching that Carmen Salazar and faculty at the University of

---

[4] It is also useful to consider the Danielson framework and the problems with liberal multiculturalist pedagogical approaches in the context of Vanessa Siddle Walker's (2009) more recent research, which recovers the forgotten history of the black educators who worked to make "real integration" rather than "second-class integration" (Siddle Walker, 2009, p. 271) a reality in the years leading up to and after *Brown v. Board of Education*. Through their organizational structures, these educator worked to build important educational opportunities for black students. Siddle Walker's (2009, 2013) work helps to expose how and why the erasure of black educators' work through white-washed history and through the mass dismissal of black educators in the wake of the *Brown* decision have led to the rise of universalist teaching criteria and frameworks. She finds that black educators created significant learning environments in segregated black schools for their students through their leadership and through their respect for and recognition of their students' abilities. These educators were able to engage and coordinate with parents for their children's education, while also challenging the negative messages that students were hearing. They inspired confidence and a sense of belonging and purpose in their students. Yet, once black educators were dismissed, administrators could ignore their many contributions to classroom pedagogy, including their visions and the ways they were transforming students' lives. According to Horace Edward Tate, executive director of the Georgia Teachers and Education Association, the loss of black educators during desegregation was "a means of diminishing the qualifications of black educators in the public mind, and … their absence in the implementation of desegregation would open the way for second-class integration" (Siddle Walker, 2009, p. 272). Many of the ongoing problems that Siddle Walker (1992) has identified in middle school and high school classrooms, including the overemphasis on process methodology and the lack of attention to what counts as teaching, learning, and engagement to students of color, are legacies of the lost opportunity during desegregation to reconceptualize and restructure the educational system around the deep knowledge, pedagogies, and organizational structures of black educators. As Siddle Walker (2013) notes, "the history of black educational intervention interrogates whether the ideals of *Brown* can successfully be accomplished if the earliest, most vocal advocates for black education no longer have a voice at the table on issues that confront black children" (p. 77).

Denver call the Framework for Equitable and Excellent Teaching (FEET) is comprised of

teaching effectiveness indicators that focus on how instructors use culturally relevant

pedagogical practices to support the ongoing learning experiences, academic engagement, and

critical consciousness of students of color, multilingual students, and their families and

communities. FEET learning indicators and competencies attempt to formalize a pedagogical

evaluation structure that values and recognizes the importance of disrupting dominant cultures

of power in education by rewarding instructors for reformulating their pedagogical practices to

reflect culturally relevant pedagogies. Among the many culturally relevant teaching practices and

approaches that FEET formally recognizes and encourages instructors to build into their daily

practices are the following:

> (a) learn about culturally relevant pedagogy and the impact of culture on learning; (b)
> build affirming relationships with students and parents; (c) demonstrate interest value
> and respect for students' home cultures and communities; (d) collaborate with parents/
> families; (e) develop a positive learning community; (f) incorporate multiple learning
> modalities; (g) engage students in collaborative learning; (h) use instructional strategies to
> support English language learners and special needs students; (i) integrate multicultural
> materials and resources; (j) develop lessons that reflect the cultures of students,
> counteract stereotypes, incorporate the contributions of diverse populations; and
> provide opportunities for social justice pursuits; (k) connect content to students'
> diversity; (l) include students' native language in instruction; and (m) differentiate
> learning experience based on students' diversity and needs. (Carmen Salazar, 2018, p.
> 469)

FEET's authors acknowledge the difficulties of eliminating dominant cultures of power from

education entirely and recognize that the FEET framework still carries elements of the generic

teaching effectiveness indicators they are trying to eliminate. Yet, they still ensure that the FEET

framework names the needs of students of color explicitly and highlights the racist and

exclusionary architecture of the education system. To this end, they have built into its evaluation

criteria different ways instructors can support underrepresented students' work in the classroom

through targeted and strategic approaches rather than universal approaches meant to assist all

students. With these elements in place, instructors can use the framework to begin shifting their

pedagogical priorities towards efforts that validate students' cultural capital, disrupt the status quo in teaching pedagogy, and destabilize the dominant cultures of power in education even as they continue to work and learn within restrictive institutions. FEET may not be able to transform the education system on its own, but by including culturally relevant teaching practices that would normally be excluded from the teaching evaluation process altogether, FEET "is strategically designed to bring visibility to Communities of Color by placing their needs at the center of teacher evaluation" (p. 469). It highlights the crucial role that equity-focused practices play not only for instructors' pedagogical success, but also for the academic, personal, and political futures of students and communities of color.[5]

FEET's evaluation indicators for K-12 instruction offer an example of the culturally relevant models for evaluating teaching effectiveness that most collective bargaining contracts currently lack, including the Unit 18 MOU at the University of California. Although UC lecturers can include a wide range of materials and accompanying narratives in their excellence review portfolios that reflect their commitments to working with students of color, the generic criteria and indicators of teaching excellence in the MOU continue to present problems for

_____

[5] The Sankofa reading program in Saint Paul, Minnesota, is an example of a program that has put into practice the same principles of culturally relevant pedagogy that the University of Denver's FEET learning indicators reflect. As a literacy program and cultural enrichment program that is structured around the understanding that students of color will succeed when they learn in environments where their cultural heritages, values, and contributions are at the center of their education, the Sankofa reading program uses culturally responsive teaching practices and culturally-based curricula within an after-school tutoring program to help African students and students of African descent to build their reading and literacy skills (Desjardins, Dupuis & Johnson, 2018). Students read African history, literature, and knowledge and work on a weekly basis both individually and in small groups with trained and experienced tutors who are from the same cultural backgrounds as the students themselves. Through scaffolded activities and rituals that are tied to their culture and heritage and by engaging in discussions and lessons that emphasize "countering self-doubt, deconstructing myths … and [building] counter-narratives" (Desjardins, Dupuis & Johnson, 2018, p. 9), students are able to build a sense of cultural identity and pride and can develop their literacy skills within this context. Sankofa also actively engages with students' parents and their communities and sees their engagement as vital to students' academic success. The program has been proven not only to help students improve their reading levels and skills, but also lays the foundation for students' long-term success in education, confidence in their ability to learn and problem-solve, and connection with their culture, family, and community (Desjardins, Dupuis & Johnson, 2018). Importantly, the Sankofa reading program first looks to students, their families, and their communities to understand the short- and long-term impacts of the program and thus evaluates culturally relevant pedagogies and instructional evaluation indicators not as isolated objects of study but always in the context of student, family, and community experiences.

lecturers who use culturally relevant pedagogies and ethnic studies pedagogies in their classrooms to help students of color succeed. Lecturers may situate their work with students of color within larger sociopolitical and economic contexts and develop pedagogical practices that challenge the logics and racial power structures of their fields, but without evaluation instruments and frameworks that reflect culturally relevant pedagogical practices, that recognize students of colors' specific needs, and that consider instructors' pedagogies within the larger histories of structural oppression and racism in education, lecturers' efforts to challenge the racist foundations of the education system may continue to be overlooked or misunderstood. In departments where administrators and managers profess a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion measures in order to support student learning, the challenges faculty of color may face in their excellence review experiences take different forms. In the first chapter of this dissertation, I examined evidence of writing programs' growing embrace of and identification with DEI initiatives, with some programs such as UC Merced's writing program even building their interest in cultural diversity and inclusion into new learning outcomes and ongoing professional development workshops for writing faculty and staff. Administrators' moves to embrace these initiatives and to encourage lecturers to rework curricular priorities so these initiatives become permanent features of writing programs seem to indicate programmatic support for and an ongoing investment in directing resources towards lecturers committed to reworking teaching evaluation criteria. If writing programs actively encourage lecturers to build curricula, programming, and instructional resources for their colleagues and students that focus explicitly on the needs and experiences of students of color, they can transform the evaluation criteria for teaching excellence. Similar to K-12 instructors working under the FEET framework, writing programs can reward Unit 18 lecturers for their commitments to developing pedagogies and resources that try to effect both material change in the lives of underrepresented students and communities as well as structural change in their fields. Under these redesigned

departmental procedures and priorities, writing programs can theoretically bypass the restrictions of the MOU's generic evaluation indicators and frameworks by rewriting the internal programmatic criteria that review committees use to evaluate teaching excellence. The new pedagogical priorities still fit within the generic teaching framework of the MOU, but reflect the program's internal commitment to prioritizing the teaching practices that actively challenge the racial power structures in the field and best support students and communities of color. By encouraging lecturers to include comprehensive qualitative materials in their teaching excellence and merit review portfolios, lecturers can control the narrative of their professional work and the interpretive framework through which their pedagogical approaches should be understood.

Even as writing programs demonstrate their willingness to rewrite their internal programmatic priorities and overhaul their evaluation frameworks, however, their efforts and the impacts of their efforts must still be considered within the larger context of the campus-wide evaluation protocols that continue to shape their work. Placing too much emphasis on the autonomy of the department and on lecturers' and program administrators' abilities to develop new teaching excellence indicators overlooks the fact that these important efforts may not always be as empowering or beneficial for lecturers as they might initially seem. UC Merced's switch to using Digital Measures as an electronic reporting system to document professional engagement for teaching excellence and merit review portfolios, for example, has been presented as a robust and efficient platform for documenting and storing faculty's teaching, research, and service activities over time. UC Merced has noted that, as a customizable system designed to meet the specific needs of each university campus that uses it, Digital Measures offers faculty who work predominately with underrepresented student populations multiple ways to document and highlight their ongoing contributions to equity, inclusion, and the advancement of equal opportunity on campus (UC Merced Academic Personnel Office, 2020a). Faculty at UC Merced who are heavily involved in equity initiatives can use Digital Measures to report on the range of

their activities in ways that best showcase the relevance and importance of their work to their teaching, research, and service at the university. Key sections of Digital Measures, including the "Diversity Activities" section (UC Merced Academic Personnel Office, 2020b) where faculty document their involvement in campus organizations and initiatives that support underrepresented student populations, have been designed specifically to allow faculty to provide relevant context for their work and to showcase to administrators the impacts and scope of their work at a glance. In these ways, the structure of Digital Measures seems to reflect that the UC system is committed to recognizing faculty efforts to address the needs of underrepresented and underserved students and communities of color (University of California Office of the President, 2020b, APM 210-1-d). As part of their responsibilities, teaching review committees are required not only to give these contributions to equity "due recognition in the academic personnel process," but to ensure they are "*evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements*" (University of California Office of the President, 2020b, APM 210-1-d, emphasis added). Because Digital Measures gives faculty flexibility in how they choose to present their equity contributions within their portfolios, UC Merced's Academic Personnel Office argues that the reporting system offers faculty, review committees, and administrators a systematic way to track, evaluate, and reward faculty for their diversity work. In Digital Measures, faculty can now highlight the service aspect of their diversity work by placing it in the Service Section of their Digital Measures file while also highlighting the research aspect of it by placing it in the Research/Publications section and contextualizing it with appropriate descriptions (UC Merced Academic Personnel Office, 2020a). This helps administrators build more accurate understandings of how faculty carry out this type of work across the three facets of their teaching, research, and service responsibilities over time and review cycles.

For lecturers and teaching professors at UC Merced (e.g., lecturers with security of employment who are on the tenure track with teaching rather than research responsibilities)

279

whose work with students of color is evaluated through their teaching and course curricula, the

teaching section of Digital Measures, and specifically the "Scheduled Teaching" sub-section, is

the most important portion of their Digital Measures file. Here, faculty present a comprehensive

history of their scheduled teaching with data entries that assist administrators and review

committees in building a clear understanding of the course structure and goals. While general

information about the course, such as the course name and code, level, enrollment numbers,

units, course type, and overall effectiveness are pre-loaded into the system by the Academic

Personnel Office (UC Merced Academic Personnel Office, 2020b), faculty are required to input

additional pieces of information and descriptions that explain how they have conceptualized and

structured each of their courses around student learning, new teaching materials, and teaching

innovations. The following prompts guide faculty members' descriptions of their course design

and pedagogical approaches to teaching the course:

- Describe any pedagogical innovations that you introduced into the course during the current year (e.g., international issues, computer applications, ethical analysis, new classroom techniques, etc.)

- Describe any new teaching material (e.g., cases, videotapes, audiotapes, course modules, instructor manuals, test banks, or simulations) that you developed and/or implemented

- Describe any activities in your courses that enhanced student learning and/or student contact with the business community (e.g., guest speaker, SBDC, SBI, or outside projects, field trips, field projects, etc.)
                                        (UC Merced Academic Personnel Office, 2020b, p. 18)

The Academic Personnel Office encourages faculty to use each of these fields to document how

their work on race in the classroom and their efforts to challenge racial inequities in their fields

are tied to their course content and to teaching excellence. Faculty can use the space in Digital

Measures to create explicit links between evaluation criteria and the specific ways that their work

advances student learning for underrepresented student populations through pedagogical and

methodological innovation. They can thus define their own indicators of what counts as

teaching excellence and innovation in ways that center the needs and cultural capital of students of color.

From an administrative standpoint, Digital Measures offers tenure-track faculty and lecturers with security of employment a useful structure for documenting and situating their equity activities. It takes equity activities as appropriate indicators of a faculty's strengths in teaching, research, and service, and in allowing instructors to define evaluation criteria according to the principles of culturally relevant pedagogy, demonstrates the university's efforts to prioritize underrepresented students' needs as a central part of both the university's educational mission and its faculty evaluation process as expressed in APM 210-1-d. When considered alongside the actual contents of each instructor's teaching portfolio itself, the reporting structure of Digital Measures can be viewed as an introductory framework that offers faculty the chance to control more fully the narrative of their teaching, research, and service. For those whose research and pedagogical approaches challenge racial power structures in their fields, Digital Measures ostensibly gives them the chance to build a new interpretive framework for administrators and review committees so that teaching excellence performance indicators can center culturally relevant pedagogy and critical race theory. Faculty can redefine pedagogical innovation, new teaching materials, and enhanced student learning in their Digital Measures file to align more closely with the needs and pedagogies most relevant to underrepresented students. Within the teaching materials they present in their portfolio (such as course syllabi, course assignments, sample student work, and accompanying annotations of these materials), instructors can demonstrate what these culturally relevant pedagogies and teaching methods actually look like in practice, how they work, and their impacts on student learning. In effect, faculty members' ability to present their teaching, research, and service history at a glance can become a cover sheet of sorts — an efficient way for faculty to design, present, and define the key themes, definitions, innovations, and theories that comprise the interpretive and pedagogical

281

framework of their portfolio. In turn, administrators will understand how to read and interpret the comprehensive contents of their teaching portfolio using these new, reconceptualized frameworks.

For non-tenure-track lecturers whose work focuses on race and equity, however, the reporting structure of Digital Measures does not support their excellence and merit reviews in quite the same ways. Unlike tenure-track faculty who have written assurances within the APM that equity and diversity activities are to be evaluated in the same manner as their other accomplishments and professional work, pre-six lecturers and lecturers with continuing appointment have no expressed commitments from the UC administration that university management is obligated to recognize and reward their efforts to address racial inequities in their teaching, research, or service to the university despite advertising Digital Measures as an appropriate platform for documenting this kind of work. Although the UC Merced Academic Personnel Office offers lecturers the same guidance on how to showcase their diversity activities in Digital Measures (UC Merced Academic Personnel Office, 2020a), and although lecturers report their professional engagement activities using the same procedures and reporting structure in Digital Measures as tenure-track faculty, the APM Criteria for Review and Appointment for lecturers fails to list equity and inclusion activities as relevant indicators of teaching excellence. Using similarly generic language as that found in the Unit 18 MOU to describe instructional excellence standards, the APM 283-10 instead states that lecturers must meet one of two qualifications to receive an appointment beyond their sixth year of service: "(1) Teaching of truly exceptional quality. (2) Teaching so specialized in character that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by regular faculty members or by strictly temporary appointees" (University of California Office of the President, 2020c, APM 283-10). It is certainly possible that departments have and expect their department review committees to utilize internal evaluation criteria that place more emphasis on contingent faculty's equity and

inclusion activities as indicators of teaching excellence than the criteria listed in APM 283-10 and the Unit 18 MOU. However, it is important to note that internal criteria and alternative evaluation frameworks specific to individual departments are neither publicly available in the same manner as they are for senate faculty nor formally incorporated into official documents published by UCOP or campus academic personnel offices that can be referenced in the event that a grievance must be filed. Within the context of publicly available documentation, then, teaching excellence for lecturers continues to be formally defined and evaluated according to the definitions provided in the generic frameworks of APM 283-10 and Article 7b of the MOU. It is always subject to the university's authority to (re)define excellence as it sees fit. Despite their programs' professed commitments to challenging social and racial inequities and to supporting their lecturers' contributions to these initiatives, lecturers in fact have little recourse if their excellence reviews results are formally based on these published definitions and generic evaluation frameworks.

Student Learning Outcomes as Innovation: The Efficiency Framework of the Excellence Review

Given these restrictions, writing program lecturers such as FA expressed deep skepticism during their interviews that calls such as Stark and Freishtat's (2014) for the inclusion of qualitative materials in teaching portfolios are sufficient to challenge or even mitigate the potentially damaging effects of the administration's unilateral control over how to define teaching excellence. FA maintains that the administrative logics underlying APM 283-10 and Article 7b of the MOU still influence the processes and guidelines for merit and excellence review that lecturers themselves have developed to mitigate administrative control over evaluation procedures and definitions. To illustrate this point, FA described how writing program lecturers consistently overlook the fact that student learning outcomes and course

learning outcomes continue to be central parts of the department's revised teaching portfolio guidelines. Although lecturers in FA's department have indicated that they want their colleagues to be able to present their teaching methods authentically and to prioritize students' needs within their revised teaching excellence guidelines and procedures, they still insist on connecting teaching excellence indicators with learning outcomes in their evaluation criteria. FA attributes their department's ongoing belief that program learning outcomes are the foundation for teaching excellence to the pervasive assessment, evaluation, and audit culture that now structures every aspect of education (Davies & Saltmarsh, 2007; Lipman, 2011). If student learning outcomes are used to track student productivity and performance, then according to assessment logics, they should also be used to structure pedagogical assessments of the instructors themselves. Similar to the excellence review guidelines set forth in the UC Merced writing program, the revised guidelines for excellence review and merit teaching portfolios within FA's writing department require writing instructors to submit a Digital Measures file in addition to substantial documentation of their teaching over a six year (for sixth year excellence reviews) or three year (for merit reviews) period. Teaching materials for excellence reviews include the following materials:

- a 2000-word statement in which instructors describe a theoretical or pedagogical concept that presents an interpretive framework for their portfolio materials and that explains how their teaching methods, curricular innovations, and professional contributions to the field or department have supported student learning and student learning outcomes

- a curriculum vitae that summarizes the lecturer's professional work experiences, university service activities, and educational background

- course syllabi with an accompanying narrative that details how and why the lecturer has designed courses as they have (with a particular focus on learning outcomes, assignments, activities, lesson plans, learning modules, etc.)

- a set of lesson plans with an accompanying narrative that explains the pedagogical rationale behind each lesson plan and how activities are organized, carried out, assessed, and designed to support student learning outcomes

- a set of writing assignments (e.g., paper prompts, classroom activities that are focused around writing or writing processes, or discussion questions that assist a student in their writing process) with an accompanying narrative that explains how and why these assignments were developed and how they facilitate student achievement of learning outcomes

- sample student work for multiple students that showcase the evolution of and improvement in each student's work over time, with an accompanying narrative that documents how course activities, instructor commentary, or peer comments contributed to improvements and the achievement of learning outcomes

- sets of student evaluations for all courses taught during the period under review with an accompanying narrative that explains how the lecturer has used this data to revise their pedagogical approaches each term and to help students meet program learning outcomes

- an evaluation of the lecturer's classroom teaching by a colleague or program administrator

FA pointed out repeatedly that all of the narratives and annotations of teaching material that writing instructors must include in their teaching portfolio, including those for course syllabi, student work, writing assignments, and lesson plans, are supposed to explain to administrators how these teaching artifacts and instructional methods align with student and course learning

285

outcomes. Lecturers are responsible for documenting how their teaching promotes student achievement as they work towards course learning outcomes, and how their pedagogical methods improve student learning experiences so students can meet these learning outcomes successfully. According to FA, the extensive work they and their colleagues do to document their pedagogical approaches does more to reinforce the validity of learning outcomes and assessment processes than it does to show how lecturers are working with students of color in culturally relevant ways using pedagogies that directly challenge the long history of structural racism in academic writing. When forced to document their work in the classroom according to the logics of learning outcomes and generic teaching indicators, lecturers have few opportunities to redefine these indicators according to their students' specific needs and experiences. Although their actual teaching practices might challenge the assumption that generic program learning outcomes are useful for all students, they cannot show this within a teaching assessment portfolio where they are expected to link every aspect of their work to students' ability to meet these outcomes.

To FA, there are significant challenges with focusing on administrator-generated learning outcomes in the teaching portfolio. Because teaching excellence is so closely associated in excellence and merit reviews with meeting student learning outcomes, FA has found that instructors use their portfolios only to demonstrate how they scaffold towards these outcomes. As a result, their innovations in teaching and newly developed pedagogical theories are often structured by conceptual frameworks dictated by the logics and envisioned products of program learning outcomes rather than by learning approaches that students of color actually use and benefit from (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). To FA, these methods are not so innovative. Instead, they see these methods leading to procedural forms of instruction where lecturers focus on delivering a *product* instead of focusing on designing relevant pedagogical approaches that account for and put each student's unique experiences and approaches to

inquiry at the center of their work. FA explained that the production of new teaching methods as a by-product of the review process — what administrators call "innovative" teaching practices that scaffold towards learning outcomes — is part of the same product-driven model that relies too heavily on common learning outcomes to support the needs of students of color within writing classrooms. According to FA, what instructors and students of color urgently need are more accurate understandings of what FA describes as "contexts of learning" — understandings of what students of color are actually doing, how they are actually making sense of things as they work, and how they build contexts as they construct knowledge and meaning in the classroom (FA, Participant Interview, June 20, 2019). These contexts of learning force instructors to move away from teaching to the arbitrary performance standards that structure student learning outcomes, and instead push them to recalibrate their teaching pedagogy according to the situated ways their students build contexts in order to learn.

To illustrate their point, FA used the example of a thesis statement, which is often taught in functionalist and formulaic ways that contribute to the procedural methods students are expected to use in their writing classes. Within FA's department, the expectation is that students in all writing classes will be able to generate thesis statements that advance arguments, select appropriate evidence that helps them to prove this thesis, and explain or analyze the evidence to show how they came to their conclusion. Instructors typically create handouts and activities for students based on this notion of thesis, argument, evidence, and analysis to offer students targeted advice on how to generate and support a thesis statement. Students are, according to FA, expected to follow what amount to formulas for generating thesis, evidence, and analysis: it is not uncommon to see handouts in instructors' teaching portfolios that offer guidelines explaining the appropriate length of a thesis, the number of sentences they should devote to analysis within a given paragraph, the proper way to set up and quote passages from texts as one might do in a literature paper (even when writing on non-literary topics), and the proper

287

guidelines for setting up and "checking" one's thesis statement. When pressed to explain why this approach would be problematic, and especially for students of color, FA argued that developing "new" ways of teaching "thesis" might look like innovation to administrators, but that most methods inevitably go back to advancing program learning outcomes that are not relevant to how students actually learn and what they know. These techniques instead advance what FA described as administrative understandings of what counts as thesis and argument, rather than what actually helps students to enhance their learning and their ability to use their own forms of inquiry to develop their papers. The handouts and formulaic ways of building a thesis and using a thesis to guide the development of a paper, in other words, prioritize *instructors'* goals and ways of thinking at the expense of *students'* cultural capital and students' methods for building what they see as the most relevant approaches to inquiry. FA explained that instructors and administrators who advocate teaching thesis in these ways regularly overlook the fact that students of color at their university come into writing courses having already taken multiple specialized courses in their intended fields of study and bring complex understandings of disciplinary methodologies and tools to their work. They *already* engage in sophisticated critical analysis based on their lived experiences and expertise as members of their communities, and they bring experience working on issues in their communities and in their classes that are more complex than the conventional topics and genres that one might find in a typical writing class or writing handbook. As such, FA believes that formulaic handouts on thesis and highly structured ways of teaching about argument do students of color a disservice: under a presumably "innovative" way of teaching thesis, students' wide ranges of expertise and knowledge are in fact suppressed when they are forced to turn their complex ways of thinking about issues into something that will fit into the reductive "observation + opinion + significance = thesis" formula for a writing class, or the equally reductive 1-sentence argument presented at the end of an essay's introduction.

Given their understanding of the range of experiences and expertise that their students bring to writing classes, FA avoids reproducing what counts as "innovation" to administrators and program directors and has rejected the typical handouts that many writing instructors believe "enhance" student learning. FA instead focuses on developing class activities and course materials that allow students to use and apply their expertise and ways of knowing and doing authentically. They avoid forcing students to read and follow writing guides that simplify topics and methods, and instead push students to read and develop specialized examples and reports so students can apply their content-level expertise. In doing so, they force students to begin reinventing what it means to write papers when they can no longer depend on generic writing toolkits like "thesis" or "thesis development activity" to guide their writing process. FA described a student of color in their class who, with the assistance of other students in the class, facilitated multiple dialogue sessions with her classmates in order to generate a working construction of an entire research paper. Without the restrictions of having to develop a traditional thesis statement to structure her work, the student used this opportunity to design her own methods for building her paper. She recognized her classmates' various strengths as analysts, critical thinkers, and emerging experts in their respective fields, and decided to engage in dialogues with them so they could co-construct and collaboratively build contexts to problem-solve using their different areas of expertise. FA argues that this student's approach was far more sophisticated and allowed the student to generate more insightful analysis and ways of working with her colleagues than anything that could have been achieved if she had followed traditional thesis or peer review guidelines. Because this student-centered way of teaching allows students to break from expected procedures and encourages them to construct different ways of building context and conceptualizing tasks, FA believes it is much more effective for ensuring that historically underrepresented students of color will thrive in a writing class. Yet, FA also recognizes that this approach might put students of color at risk in other classes because it does

not adhere to instructor or administrative expectations of what "counts" as appropriate or expected processes and procedures. The students of color in FA's class in fact excel when they use these open methods, but because these approaches do not look or work like the typical methods instructors recognize or expect, students are often forced in other classes to revert back to product- and step-driven procedures that are tightly controlled by instructors. FA notes that the constructive methods their student used to generate a working construction of her entire paper are a clear example of both the promise and the problems of using these methods within structured settings: "*That's* how she does it [constructs papers], but this doesn't fit the [traditional] guidelines. It is a deviation from a functionalist approach that is not presumed to be effective. Students of color don't subscribe to the functionalist way. They talk *together* to generate the *entire paper* instead of putting an engine in a car that you haven't designed yet. But this looks unfocused to someone who wants to teach thesis" (FA, Participant Interview, August 16, 2019). FA acknowledged that it is common for the genius of students' methods to go unrecognized by instructors and for instructors to label these methods as "unfocused" or "incorrect." The same labels are often applied to instructors' unconventional pedagogical approaches as well, which FA noted was an ongoing issue they had seen when working with students in tutorial programs designed to serve underrepresented students of color and low-income students. Tutors who worked to center both students of color's cultural capital and their unique ways of building learning contexts were criticized regularly by administrators for not teaching students traditional, genre-based conventions: "[These] tutors were criticized for being unfocused, and for not focusing on thesis. They may have been 'unfocused,' but students who didn't have a thesis were getting a B+ on their papers. Students who had a thesis were getting C+. Do you want a B+ or a thesis? This [focus on thesis] is an issue because it overlooks the parts of their [students'] lives that make a huge difference" (FA, Participant Interview, August 16, 2019). Instructors such as FA who choose to center their teaching around these authentic contexts of learning and who

290

choose to present these forms of student-centered teaching in their excellence or merit review portfolios are at a distinct disadvantage because their teaching materials do not "look" like teaching materials "should" look from an administrative perspective. If they do not include evidence of teaching that reflects genre-based conventions or that reflects work that can be recognized easily within traditional academic writing assessment frameworks, administrators struggle to understand how their portfolios display evidence of effective teaching performance.

For these reasons, FA has often questioned the assumption that introducing extensive documentation and annotation requirements in the teaching excellence review process automatically gives all lecturers a fair chance to demonstrate the value of the work they do with students of color. Instructors who, like FA, try to change the work and pedagogies of academic writing altogether often run the risk of their work being misunderstood in evaluation processes that administrators structure according to traditional disciplinary practices and learning outcomes. FA described Digital Measures and the portfolio process as, "a selective mechanism for who gets more money, but [that] denies more people pay" because both require instructors to document their work according to preconceived assumptions about what counts as pedagogical innovation, evidence of enhanced student learning, and teaching excellence (FA, Participant Interview, August 16, 2019). Based on their experiences and observations of working with other faculty as they assemble their teaching portfolios, FA maintains that these definitions and forms of documentation within the sixth year and merit review processes have historically been used to deny promotion to lecturers who fail to present materials that align with department expectations, even if the instructors' teaching approaches lead to long-term gains for students of color. They see the dangers of the seemingly comprehensive reach of the excellence review portfolio and Digital Measures and their simultaneously restrictive parameters as follows: "[With the materials provided in the portfolio] they have the documentation they need to say, 'no innovation' or 'not everyone is getting A's.' But if all your students get A's, they

291

say you're too easy" (FA, Participant Interview, August 16, 2019). To FA, the extensive documentation and annotation requirements serve a different purpose than what departments explain to faculty. Working hand in hand with administrative control over the non-referential nature of excellence, the extensive documentation requirements offer the deep context and specificity administrators need to be able to decide what they mean by "excellence" or "non-excellence" while also giving them the flexibility to redefine or modify this definition at any moment based on what they see in the portfolio. FA commented on the unequal nature of this process. While lecturers must submit detailed narratives explaining their pedagogical rationales and logics for all activities, lesson plans, assignments, commentary on student papers, and more — often resulting in portfolios that are well over 100 pages of meticulously annotated documents and newly created narrative materials — administrators give little information to lecturers about what they are looking for, how they plan to review and use these materials, and why they require lecturers to submit so much information. FA's university offers annual workshops designed to help lecturers learn how to assemble their teaching portfolio materials; yet, FA described these workshops as unhelpful and too focused on process, as they often consist of administrators re-explaining the content requirements of different sections of the portfolio rather than offering lecturers space to work with experienced colleagues who can help them *build* more effective teaching approaches and materials to serve students' needs. FA explained that the tips offered in these workshops such as "be clear," "explain how your activity enhances student learning," and "add diversity and equity issues" simply echo the prompts in Digital Measures and reveal more about *perceived assumptions about what would be helpful forms of feedback* than about the actual ways lecturers' portfolio materials will be read, assessed, and evaluated (FA, Participant Interview, August 16, 2019). Moreover, the workshops have never helped lecturers understand how they can develop and hone their teaching methods so they can work with students of color in meaningful or effective ways. As a result, the portfolio

292

workshops, similar to the formulaic forms of "innovation" and enhance student learning that FA criticized earlier, offer generic formulas for *assembling* a portfolio and making superficial changes to appeal to readers' preconceived expectations instead of serving as a space to help lecturers build and strengthen their teaching practices. According to FA's analysis, these workshops come too late in an instructor's teaching career and prioritize traditional goals. They allow administrators to prove that they have dutifully provided an informational workshop to support lecturers' preparation for the excellence review, but fail to demonstrate real commitments to helping lecturers figure out continuously over the course of their careers how to build and design new teaching methods for working with students of color that truly support the students' ways of doing and thinking. FA's colleagues often walked away from portfolio workshops with the sense that their materials would meet the standards because their materials were "clear" and followed the guidelines presented in the workshop. However, despite the overabundance of documentation in their portfolios that seemingly aligned with the workshop recommendations, these lecturers were surprised upon receiving their formal evaluation results to find what they described as "cherry-picked evidence" from their materials that were used to document supposed problems with their work based on criteria that were not made clear to them within the portfolio workshops.

During our discussions, FA repeatedly stressed the need for lecturers to recognize the existing problems with the current excellence review procedures, which they believe Digital Measures has only exacerbated. As the reporting and documentation structures for the review process in their department have evolved, FA sees Digital Measures as yet another tool to help administrators collect and categorize materials so they can continue to standardize and tighten their control over definitions of teaching excellence (FA, Participant Interview, August 16, 2019). FA's concerns have been questioned by their colleagues who believe that Digital Measures gives them the space to explain their pedagogical approaches and activities in ways that mitigate some

of the structural problems with the sixth-year portfolio itself. Yet, closer analysis of Digital

Measures by Watermark's (2020a) official marketing materials reveal that FA's concerns about the

ulterior motives for and impacts of using Digital Measures as a reporting structure are not

entirely unfounded. FA and their colleagues are told that Digital Measures is meant to build

more effective ways to highlight the true work they do with students, but Watermark (2020a)

instead presents Digital Measures primarily as a tool for increasing workflow, documentation,

and data collection efficiency when reporting faculty's teaching, research, and service activities

for administrative and accreditation outcomes and assessment purposes. To the company itself, it

is not a tool designed to help administrators understand more accurately instructors' pedagogical

practices and logics. Watermark formed in 2017 when Taskstream, Tk20, and LiveText joined

together and consolidated their efforts to deliver more robust software for e-portfolios and

assessment management under the new title of Watermark (Watermark, 2018). While its original

goal was to ensure that administrators in higher education would be able to generate the kind of

data needed to make decisions about how to improve education, the company has since focused

on offering solutions to help improve data collection and workflow management. With the

acquisition of Digital Measures in 2018, Watermark was able to add Digital Measures' data

collection features, faculty activity reporting mechanisms (for teaching, research, and service),

and workflow modules to its collection, all of which were designed to enhance efficiency around

reporting and data collection for faculty review processes in higher education. This has since

allowed the company to expand its capacity to include institutional outcomes assessment and

accreditation management as part of its services. When these new services are used in

conjunction with Watermark's other tools — data collection and reporting workflows, tools for

managing course evaluations and institutional surveys, and management systems for curriculum

and course catalogs — institutions can "use better data to improve learning and institutional

quality" and to "improve institutional outcomes" (Watermark, 2018).

Watermark is committed to improving the efficiency and power of data collection, measurement, and assessment and maintains that evidence-based analysis and solutions are critical for shaping institutions' educational initiatives and for driving institutional change. However, the company's interpretation of what it means to "empower better learning" is driven by different interests than students' and instructors' day-to-day pedagogical needs. Watermark's page to promote Digital Measures, for instance, states, "Capture Faculty Information Once, Use It Infinitely" (Watermark, 2020a) and describes its faculty activity reporting structure as one that allows faculty to "spend less time entering their accomplishments … [so that] you have the most current information for promoting your university, impressing donors, and streamlining reporting for review processes, accreditation and more" (Watermark, 2020a). Despite its claims that Digital Measures will "empower better learning," nowhere on these pages does the company associate Digital Measures with pedagogical initiatives or discuss how tracking and documenting faculty activities will assist instructors in their daily classroom practices or in their ability to enhance the learning opportunities for particular student populations. The company instead sees its ability to streamline data management processes and workflows as a tool to help administrators promote their universities and attract donors, while the value of instructors' reports about their "high-impact practices" in the classroom is measured in terms of their utility for accreditation reporting (Watermark, 2020a). There is no discussion of how these activities lead to educational change in the university, nor is there discussion about how Watermark's tools can bring instructors' "high-impact practices" to more students who would benefit from them. Data collection workflows and the documentation of faculty activities are presented largely in terms of the economic and reporting benefits they offer to administrators preparing for accreditation reviews. Watermark's handbook, which describes how its systems support universities in documenting and determining faculty qualifications (Watermark, 2020b), similarly frames these documentation efforts as critical for meeting regional accreditors' requirements and

accreditation qualification standards; yet, it offers no insight into how this enhances student learning or shapes university efforts to reconceptualize what counts as effective pedagogical practices for particular student populations. Instructors such as FA's colleagues may look to Digital Measures as a way to exercise some control over the narratives they want to create about their teaching practices, but Digital Measures is a tool for generating accreditation reports and data for administrators. As a data management system, it does more to help administrators meet accreditation requirements than it does to help administrators and instructors to reevaluate and redesign teaching assessment frameworks, or to transform pedagogical practices to support student learning. Though presented as a tool to help instructors showcase their pedagogical contributions, Digital Measures helps administrators to reinforce the legitimacy of assessment, accreditation, and credentialing systems within the neoliberal university.

This raise larger questions about what efforts educators should be focusing on to improve pedagogical practices and to effect structural change for students of color if the existing reporting and assessment structures largely serve long-term administrative goals. Excellence reviews and documentation systems like Digital Measures are premised on data collection that happens well after the fact, as their workflows and data collection tools are meant to streamline instructors' efforts to report on several years' worth of teaching practices, curricular materials, and service activities often years after they were originally designed and implemented. Both the review system and the reporting tool prioritize retrospective learning: any structural changes made at the individual, classroom, departmental, or university level are based solely on longitudinal data from the evaluation process. Yet, the portfolio requirements and Digital Measures are set up to document a lecturer's pedagogical history by course or course section (within Digital Measures) or by lesson and activity (within the materials requested by the department). This creates unanticipated difficulties for instructors as they decide what to show about their work in the classroom. The long view of an individual instructor's pedagogical and

professional work history is critical for understanding how they develop and hone their teaching methods and their work with students over time, but FA explained that the portfolio and Digital Measures create arbitrary reporting period cutoffs that make it difficult for lecturers to explain their work accurately. FA and their colleagues had to document their teaching histories within Digital Measures using a course-by-course approach, which prevented them from using what they believed were the most appropriate longitudinal periods and units of measurement needed to understand their teaching approaches. They were required to build course entries for each course they taught for each term within the reporting period under review, and then were asked to document their pedagogical innovations, new teaching materials, and new activities for each course. FA maintained that this course-by-course approach has become problematic for writing program instructors, given that most instructors within their department typically teach multiple sections of the same courses each term and academic year. FA argued, "If you always have the same classes year after year, how do you show innovation for each class? … If we have to present new materials every three years, how do we build on work we did in previous review periods? We can't bank on things done before in previous semesters." (FA Participant Interview, August 16, 2019). The expectation, in other words, is that because instructors must document pedagogical innovation for each class they teach for any given term, lecturers who teach three sections of the same introductory reading and composition course per term must pilot, develop, and document multiple types of pedagogical innovation, new teaching materials, and new activities for each section of the same course that term, even if their processes for developing new materials and activities are not section-based or based on three-year or six-year periods.

In FA's department, is not uncommon for administrators to assign instructors to teach multiple sections of the same one or two courses for six years straight and to require all instructors to teach and assign the same "common" texts, assignments, or research projects and papers in an effort to promote curricular consistency across all sections. Digital Measures's

reporting structure requires that these instructors still find ways to "innovate" and develop new materials even for courses whose curricula have been prescribed by their departments. The pressures of having to develop multiple and distinct pedagogical innovations for different sections of the same course within the same term and for multiple years encourages instructors in FA's department to engage in what they call "minor innovation." This practice allows instructors to make superficial adjustments to activities and teaching methods so that they seem innovative, even though they still subscribe to traditional assumptions about student learning, step-driven procedures, learning outcomes, and what students' final "products" should look like (FA, Participant Interview, August 16, 2019). As an example, FA explained that instructors will regularly recreate activities such as peer review and collaborative writing with new titles to make them seem new, while also supplementing these activities with prompts and guides that outline the steps students should follow to complete the assignment. These are slight but easily implemented modifications to traditional assignments and "count" as innovations in teaching to administrators who value program learning outcomes, genre-based writing, and step-driven activities, even if the activities fail to offer students of color the space to bring their own ways of doing and thinking to their work. Having students work in "project teams" to engage in research and to review each others' work, for instance, may seem innovative and beneficial for writing in disciplines where research is typically conducted independently, but may not require that students do anything fundamentally different from the work they already do in traditional peer review groups. This is particularly true if instructors still require students working in project teams to follow a scripted set of instructions about what they should comment on, review together, and focus on in their teams. Quite similarly, the move within FA's department to begin having students write annotated bibliographies for their research writing courses has been presented as a novel practice in excellence reviews. Yet, the formulaic directions students receive for how to construct each sentence of their annotations suggest that this "new" activity is a

298

reworked hybrid of heavily guided reading logs and fill-in-the-blank worksheets that give students little freedom to build interpretations, methods, and forms of analysis specific to the real needs of their research projects and fields. To FA, these minor changes allow instructors to present themselves within Digital Measures as innovative, but with little need to ensure that their innovations attend to the actual work students of color are capable of doing or to the impacts these practices have on students' immediate and long-term learning experiences. Bousquet (2008) refers to these forms of endless innovation for the purposes of meeting target performance standards and evaluation requirements as the entrepreneurial practice of "continuous reinvention" in order to produce "'continuous quality improvement' where 'quality' means efficiency" (p. 104). Instructors such as FA who attempt to challenge the racial power structure in writing instruction believe their own teaching methods are too unconventional to include in Digital Measures since they may not look innovative like the materials their colleagues are presenting or that university administrators expect to see. Teaching methods like FA's, which are "reinvention[s] of interdisciplinary approaches and the live construction of materials across disciplines with a WAC/WID [Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing In the Disciplines] emphasis" (FA, Participant Interview, August 16, 2019), depend on understanding students' individual backgrounds and unique expertise and thus are difficult to explain within an activity reporting system that defines innovation, learning, and materials according to the logics of universally prescribed learning outcomes. For FA, working with each student is always a process of innovation because they must work with the student to discover and design methods unique to that student's individual ways of building contexts and making sense of material. According to FA, teaching excellence review processes thus do not reward instructors for real innovation that disrupts the normative logics of generic writing assignments and pedagogies. Instead, they reward the reproduction of norms and processes that have historically disenfranchised underrepresented students and communities. In the meantime, the real processes of innovation

that lead to better outcomes for students of color, that situate learning within larger sociopolitical contexts in order to challenge racial and structural oppression in education, and that align with the principles of culturally relevant pedagogies never reach the eyes of administrators. Lecturers like FA have learned that anything they do that does not fit within a logics of an administrative and excellence framework, including the live construction of contexts and student-designed methods, does not advance their careers or lead to promotions, and so those materials are not included in their excellence review portfolios.

Challenging the Logics of Excellence and Innovation

In our discussions, FA pointed to three important changes they believe can shift writing pedagogies and evaluation procedures away from administrative interests and towards the practices that can give students of color the space to build methods and contexts of learning specific to their interests and backgrounds. The first needed change is to redefine excellence in student work. The notion of excellence in teaching reviews is premised both for lecturers and for students on the assumption that those who are "excellent" produce work that aligns with managerial expectations, learning outcomes, and evaluation criteria. To FA, it is counterproductive to maintain these logics of excellence. In departments such as theirs, administrators and instructors associate excellence with "A" students and product-driven classroom activities thought to be universally beneficial for all students. However, these definitions overlook the cultural capital and pedagogical needs of students of color and discount the unconventional pedagogical practices that have the most potential to contribute to structural change. FA argues that instead, programs need to redefine excellence so it encompasses students who go from writing "C" papers to writing "B+" papers as well as the pedagogical practices that build situated constructions based on individual students' ways of thinking and doing in the classroom. FA maintains that these approaches would allow both lecturers and students to

confront the histories of contestation and oppression that structure academic writing and discourse and to reenvision the work of reading and composition courses. Redefining excellence in these ways would push writing programs to center their work around their students rather than around the reproduction of conventional techniques and outcomes-based performance standards.

The second change FA calls for in writing programs is a change in excellence and merit review evaluation procedures. In FA's department, instructors are evaluated by their own colleagues in the department, but FA argues that teaching portfolios should be evaluated by administrators or colleagues with extensive backgrounds in the same subject area, methods, and student populations that the lecturers under review teach. Currently in FA's department, instructors with no interest in working with students of color or in using culturally relevant pedagogy evaluate the portfolios of instructors whose entire careers have been devoted to challenging the racial power structures. Similarly, administrators and instructors with only a general background in writing in the disciplines (WID) evaluate the work of technical and professional writing courses taught by lecturers with academic training in these fields. Their writing assignments and teaching methods regularly require students to use their science, math, social science, and humanities backgrounds. The generalized criteria with which these lecturers are evaluated fail to reflect their and their students' levels of expertise, and lead review committees to base their assessments of teaching excellence in WID on what FA calls "impressions" rather than expertise. Because the existing review system does not require that review committee members have discipline- or population-specific expertise, it operates under the false assumption that there are universal teaching practices immediately "recognizable" or identifiable to any writing instructor. According to FA, this assumption means that review committees run the risk of overlooking or dismissing as irrelevant the real work that students and lecturers with specialized backgrounds are actually doing in their classes. In FA's department,

301

writing program administrators and instructors without the appropriate background or understanding of research in other disciplines regularly default to the expectation that instructors teaching WID classes can simply modify the teaching methods and learning outcomes from entry-level writing courses and apply them to any discipline. These assumptions are problematic, as experts in other disciplines actively reject and work against writing programs' unscientific approaches to analyzing and writing about technical concepts that require methodological and content expertise. Students at FA's university quickly realize that one of the few places on campus where they can actually receive the kind of hands-on training required for advanced writing in other disciplines is in research groups or research labs. FA maintains that writing programs must do a better job of helping to prepare students for these forms of specialized writing, as most students of color are rarely selected to become research assistants or members of these groups and labs. By requiring that members of evaluation committees and hiring committees have the disciplinary backgrounds needed to understand better the innovative pedagogical and technical work that writing instructors and their students are doing in their WID courses, writing program administrators and instructors could build courses that help all students of color develop the technical expertise and methods that they need to transform their fields.

FA's final observation is that writing instructors need to spend more time building pedagogical mentoring spaces that they control so they can develop and hone their pedagogies regularly and collaboratively without the interference of administrators and managers. The retrospective focus in teaching portfolios over the span of six or three years and the general, product-driven feedback they receive in department-led portfolio workshops make it difficult for lecturers to build stronger foundations for reconceptualizing and reformulating both their teaching approaches and their underlying assumptions about their students' experiences and knowledge. FA argues that lecturers need consistent opportunities to work with their colleagues

to develop, test, and rework non-functionalist pedagogical innovations that are premised on situated, real-time constructions of material. They need spaces where they can focus on designing pedagogies that will support students' authentic ways of constructing contexts to learn, rather than spaces where they are forced to create "minor innovations" to meet administrators' evaluation standards. FA believes that new lecturers should be working closely with experienced lecturers and students from the first day they arrive on campus so they can begin building novel ways of teaching and constructing materials based on students' unique ways of knowing and doing. This collaborative and co-constructed effort would focus lecturers' and students' efforts on collectively building the most effective pedagogies and instructional networks for the historically underrepresented student populations they serve. In these ways, lecturers and students of color can collectively drive structural change in their departments at the curricular, ideological, and pedagogical levels rather than continuing to assume that their benevolent writing program administrators will lead the charge. To be clear, FA does not envision these spaces or relationships as the typical "mentoring meetings" that are common in writing programs where pre-six lecturers meet individually with continuing appointment lecturers to ask questions, receive sage advice, and gain insight into the inner workings of academia and the excellence review. FA's vision for sustained pedagogical collaboration is instead premised on the recognition that all lecturers have a responsibility to work directly with their colleagues (both new and continuing) *and with students* in a concerted, collective, and continuous way to build situated pedagogies and understandings of their students' real expertise. FA believes these people-centered approaches, not learning outcomes, will drive real innovation in faculty and student work and serve as the foundation for structural change in writing departments. For FA, this does not mean assembling more committees or faculty interest groups that will issue reports to administrators, nor does it mean allowing department administrators or program learning outcomes to dictate the parameters of their work. Rather, this means the formation of

a rank-and-file space where lecturers and students would critically examine the underlying frameworks of the composition field while working together to build pedagogical practices with their students that emerge from and respond to the students themselves. Through daily praxis and figuring out how to build new tools, theories, methodologies, and materials that challenge the status quo, they will be able to redefine the real responsibilities of writing programs both in and beyond the academy. This space is one that FA believes would open critical opportunities for lecturers and students to reinvent pedagogical practice and to drive structural change from below in departments that have historically reified learning outcomes and instructor-focused solutions. Within FA's vision, transforming the definition of what counts as innovation depends on lecturers putting into daily practice the live (re)construction of pedagogies, materials, and working relationships with students. This requires that they not only see students of color as critical collaborators and inventors of relevant pedagogical practice, but that they commit to collaborating with and putting the students' visions and ways of doing at the center of their work.

Conclusion

As neoliberal ideologies and policies continue to restructure the university, writing programs have increasingly come to reflect and reproduce the values and logics of a business model of education. With the rise of the WPA and the growing precarity of writing programs' increasingly flexible workforce, it has become difficult for writing instructors who are committed to advancing social and racial justice to bring about structural change in their departments. Within the managerial university, WPAs are often presumed to be the heroic allies in adjunct instructors' fight to control their working conditions and to transform the racist disciplinary writing practices that disenfranchise students of color. Yet, WPAs are required to advance the economic and ideological goals of the university according to market-based logics that are at

304

odds with both the labor-based needs of contingent faculty and the pedagogical needs of students of color. WPAs thus play a critical role in the neoliberal academy as they manage an increasingly stratified workforce in university writing programs: they help to foster the "managerial unconscious" that encourages contingent faculty to believe that their managers share their experiences and interests, even as contingent faculty continue to be subjected to the unanticipatable fluctuations of a just-in-time labor pool. In these ways, university administrators have been able to undermine many of the victories that contingent faculty had already made towards transforming their working conditions through collective bargaining.

As writing programs continue to operate within the constraints of the business model of education, contingent writing instructors have changed their pedagogical methods according to the expectations and pressures of working in an audit culture. Facing the constant pressures of being evaluated on the effectiveness and efficiency of their teaching and learning practices, writing instructors have begun to teach to administrator-controlled learning outcomes and teaching excellence standards. Administrative logics and the notion of "teaching excellence" as a presumed indicator of pedagogical effectiveness now dictate teaching pedagogy more than the learning and pedagogical needs of students. For students of color, the impacts of these shifts are particularly problematic: purportedly innovative ways of teaching writing in fact reproduce Western values and ignore the affective dimensions of teaching and learning that are crucial for students of color and black students in particular. Within a model of education that prioritizes process-based pedagogical approaches meant to benefit *all* students without looking at the unique definitions of teaching, learning, and engagement that students of color bring to the writing classroom, academic writing classes and writing instructors reproduce the assumption that teaching excellence is a methodological practice that can be learned, measured, and evaluated according to criteria that administrators set and change at will according to their labor needs and ideological interests. As WPAs and writing instructors readily embrace both neoliberal

305

learning outcomes and attempt to reinvent their teaching practices to meet standards of excellence within a business model of education, the values of the neoliberal university begin to overshadow what should arguably be writing instructors' primary focus — developing pedagogical approaches that support students of color so they can thrive academically and transform the spaces in which they live and work.

Despite the problems that neoliberal values and structures have created for writing programs and students of color, contingent faculty and students of color have undertaken many efforts to change the conditions in which they work and learn by creating alternative visions, practices, and working relationships within the university. Over the past several years, FA has initiated multiple efforts to create the rank-and-file lecturer- and student-controlled space they described in our interviews where instructors and students can co-construct new pedagogical practices that reenvision the work of writing programs and disrupt the racial power structures that suppress students' authentic ways of learning and engaging. FA was inspired to create these spaces because they recognized the shortcomings of the excellence review process and saw the effects when instructors began to adjust their pedagogies to fit administrator-controlled definitions of excellence and innovation. After witnessing first hand both the short term gains but long term damage that "minor innovation" pedagogies and teaching materials had on the academic and professional career trajectories of students of color, FA wanted to make visible the drawbacks of putting too much faith in the leadership and logics of the heroic WPA and the excellence review process. Students of color may quickly learn how to formulate a thesis statement or build an annotated bibliography using the steps and criteria laid out in activities and teaching handouts that meet all administrative evaluation indicators for teaching excellence and innovation; yet, methods that are tied to administrative learning outcomes invariably ignore and suppress the rich ways of constructing knowledge and building context that students of color bring to the classroom and are always reinventing. To FA, *students* are real innovators and their

306

authentic processes of inquiry the real forms of innovation that, if recognized, always force faculty to reinvent their pedagogical work towards more impactful ends. Within this framework, then, and within the collaborative, co-constructed spaces that FA has tried to create, both faculty and students can work to build projects and live pedagogical approaches that center the students, their communities, and their projects. As a space that is free from managerial oversight and administrative interests, instructors and students can reimagine inside it the work of writing programs and work towards building new processes, relationships, and systems for learning.

Like the Wyoming Resolution, however, which began as an unanticipated grassroots effort but which was ultimately rejected by the field in order to maintain the existing labor structure, the rank-and-file spaces FA and their colleagues have created and the critical dialogues they have begun to have around race and pedagogy have been coopted consistently by managerial logics. Instructors increasingly have used the space not only as a platform to carry out administrative tasks and learning outcomes, but also as a strategic tool for self-preservation and needed monetary gain during excellence and merit review cycles. Conversations around pedagogical innovation and students of color have devolved into conversations about aligning their efforts with administrative learning outcomes, while what was supposed to be a proactive and collaborative problem-solving space for students and lecturers has since become a lecturer-only space where curricular and pedagogical decisions are made about how best to support students of color without the presence and expertise of the very people they are discussing. These shifts in the tone, purpose, and work of the space illustrate the difficulties of breaking away from the normative logics of a field and education system that remain deeply invested in using both the market logics of neoliberalism and the assessment standards of an audit culture to create structural change. Writing program administrators and disciplinary norms still retain a disproportionate amount of influence over faculty even within spaces that are supposed to challenge the status quo. This is due in part to the ways that the teaching review processes, which

are structured by and in dominance, incentivize alignment with administrative definitions of pedagogical innovation, excellence, and relevance. The work, then, that both instructors such as FA and their students face as they try to reimagine the work of writing classes is not just a matter of creating spaces that are physically free of WPAs and managerial oversight. It also requires confronting the reality that as they continue to work and learn in a system that rewards the reproduction of dominant ideologies, they will constantly need to confront and renegotiate how they respond to these logics and ideologies as they reemerge in both their colleagues' practices and their own practices.

While efforts to build new processes and spaces that prioritize the rank-and-file over the heroic WPA have not always been successful in college and university writing programs, understanding and making visible both the histories of and processes by which contingent faculty have resisted managerial control over their working conditions and teaching methods are critical for informing the work and conversations that still remain to be done. While faculty and their students face immense challenges as they challenge the logics of efficiency and standardization, their ongoing efforts to question disciplinary norms and to reimagine their work also reveal the ways that, as Lipman (2011) puts it, "neoliberalization as a hegemonic process is contingent, contested, and partial" — a project that "is rife with contradictions and fissures that give rise to global social movements and alliances of all types" (p. 10). Faculty and students of color have continuously been able to open spaces in order to set forth alternative agendas, to promote new forms of analysis, and to put into practice new ways of working with each other that are antithetical to academic capitalism. In doing so, they reveal the weaknesses of the neoliberal project in both the university and in writing programs and show that, even as administrators and managers retain control over writing programs and instructional methods, this control is always under threat as contingent faculty and students find new ways to articulate their needs and to create the processes, alliances, and forms of analysis they need to transform

their working and learning conditions. These histories will be critical for writing instructors and student to know and use as they continue their efforts to reimagine the real work and responsibilities of writing classes in advancing racial justice.

Chapter Five: "What Can Writing Mean In Your Lives?": Contemporary Academic Writing Classes in Asian American Studies at UC Berkeley and San Francisco State University

Given the ongoing challenges that university writing programs face in supporting students of color, writing instructors must figure out how to reconcile their efforts to transform the racist pedagogical practices and disciplinary ideologies in composition programs with the constraints of working in a neoliberal university that expects them to adhere to disciplinary standards. Despite arguments that writing program administrators (WPAs) can lead the way in advancing structural change in university writing programs, researchers (notably Bousquet 2004, 2008) maintain that composition managers' responsibility for advancing the ideological and economic goals of the university make it impossible for them to make decisions that are in the best working interests of instructional faculty. Rank-and-file efforts to control their own working conditions and to determine the standards by which their work should be assessed threaten the stability of the contingent labor system in the neoliberal university, which prioritizes economic efficiency over the needs of its workers. For writing instructors like FA and Alex, the neoliberal logics that structure their work as contingent faculty directly impact their ability to support students of color in their classes. Although WPAs and writing programs have eagerly adopted the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion as part of campus-wide efforts to attend to students of color's needs, they continue to use generic performance indicators and learning outcomes to measure student learning and to define what counts as excellence in their teaching assessment procedures. By accepting multicultural curricula as evidence of anti-racist consciousness and by designing teaching evaluation processes that reward instructors for using product-driven pedagogies, writing departments have been able to avoid having to build the structural resources and support systems that instructors need to challenge the field's racist

disciplinary ideologies and pedagogies. As university administrators continue to prioritize diversity initiatives and market-based labor systems over the needs of both students and faculty of color, it has become increasingly difficult for faculty and students to use academic writing classes as a vehicle to advance social, material, and pedagogical change. Although writing faculty may use culturally relevant pedagogies and design new methodological approaches that support students of color's long-term academic and professional trajectories, the value of their work is rarely recognized if it fails to align with traditional disciplinary practices and teaching excellence standards. As the market-based logics of the neoliberal university suppress and disincentivize faculty and students of color's efforts to challenge the racial power structures in writing programs, the important ways they have reimagined the pedagogical, methodological, and political work of composition classes are often written out of the official narratives of composition studies entirely.

Traditional university writing programs' tendency to ignore student- and instructor-led efforts to transform the field's ideologies and disciplinary practices is not unique to the contemporary, neoliberal university. The creation of reading and composition courses in UC Berkeley's (UCB) Asian Studies Division[1] in the early 1970s is a clear example of how university writing programs have strategically distanced themselves from the important pedagogical advances that other departments have made in academic writing instruction. Elaine Kim reveals that after the early Asian Studies division at UC Berkeley established its reading and composition sequence in 1971, the university writing program failed to collaborate with or build a working

---

[1] The UC Berkeley's Asian American Studies program has changed its name several times over the course of its fifty year history. It was originally called the Asian Studies Division when it formed in 1969 and changed its name to Contemporary Asian Studies in 1973. By 1978, it had changed its name to the Asian American Studies program and kept this name until 2000 when it became the Asian American and Asian Diaspora Studies program. Throughout this chapter, I use these different names to reflect the specific name the program had during the specific time period I am writing about. When discussing lengthy time periods when the program may have undergone several program name changes, I refer to the program as the Asian American Studies program. This method follows the method used by L. Ling-chi Wang (2019), emeritus professor who helped to establish Berkeley's Asian American Studies program, when he refers to the program in his publications.

relationship with the division despite the extensive work the division had done to reenvision academic writing as a political project that challenged the field's racist pedagogical practices and ideologies (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). Kim notes that for ten years, other departments on campus ignored and marginalized the Asian American Studies program and other Ethnic Studies programs at Berkeley, leaving them to work and teach their composition classes on their own under the assumption that these divisions would eventually "atrophy on the vine" (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). Although the Asian American Studies program was still required to follow regulations issued by the reading and composition campus committees, the College of Letters and Sciences, and the Committee on Courses, Kim recalls that "nobody really paid much attention to us" (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). The UCB university writing program's lack of interest in what the Asian American students and faculty were building is telling. Although the university would eventually be forced to concede and adapt some of the forms and demands of the early Asian Studies division's reading and composition courses, including eliminating the instituted fee for Subject A and allowing other departments to build their own reading and composition sequences, it refused to engage with the political project of the Asian American Studies writing courses. The university never formally acknowledged that these courses were designed to help students build the knowledge necessary to solve urgent problems in their communities and in society, nor did the university recognize the importance of having academic writing classes become one of the places where students of color could do this kind of work. This meant that the university writing program could continue to reproduce the same logics of whiteness and strategic alignment with disciplinary norms even as it was forced to adopt several of the new procedures that the early Asian Studies division had pushed for. Repeated attempts in program review reports over the next twenty years to link the work of the Asian American Studies writing courses to service learning and remedial education meant that the Asian American Studies program's most valuable

312

and innovative contributions to the field of academic writing and to the academic and professional lives of students of color were never fully recognized or appreciated. As such, its visionary work was, and arguably still is, lost to composition studies and even to the new generation of Ethnic Studies faculty and students.

Although the UCB Asian American Studies program has long offered successful models for how to advance racial and social justice in academic writing classes, its methods for transforming academic writing into a political project have been omitted from the official narratives of Berkeley's academic writing history and never gained traction beyond the Ethnic Studies Department itself. As university writing programs and WPAs continue to struggle to support students of color and to understand how to reconceptualize curricular change beyond the constraints of literary representation and disciplinary logics, they continue to overlook the advances that Asian American Studies programs have made in writing instruction. UCB's Asian American Studies writing instructors have already reenvisioned academic writing to support students of color's demands for writing instruction relevant to their histories, lives, and futures; yet, the persistent siloing of university writing programs from other departments has created a disconnect between writing as conceptualized and controlled by WPAs and the transformative work students and faculty of color have been doing at the so-called peripheries of writing programs and the university. These failures have meant that movements to initiate substantive ideological, political, and pedagogical change have been slow to gain traction in mainstream composition programs, raising important questions about what is lost when composition programs fail to look outwards. What happens when university writing programs fail to learn from the interdisciplinary work that other departments like UCB's Asian American Studies program have been developing and honing for over fifty years? What is possible when writing classes use the transformative pedagogies and interdisciplinary methodologies that both Ethnic Studies departments and instructors like FA and Alex have designed and begun to implement

313

with success in their classes? What is possible when we design writing classes where students can build projects that address what they see as pressing needs in their lives and communities?

This chapter examines the work that has been done in the UCB Asian American Studies program since the 1980s and the recent work that the Asian American Studies department and College of Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State University have undertaken to reenvision academic writing from the voices, perspectives, and experiences of students and communities of color. As programs that emerged from student-led activism and a commitment to serving the community, both programs' reenvisionings of writing instruction connect writing and the teaching of writing to one's roots, narratives, and community. Far from seeing writing as only a skills-based outcome or mastery of disciplinary conventions, Asian American Studies at UC Berkeley and San Francisco State have both turned what is commonly thought to be a question of technical form and skill into a political question: how can the teaching of academic writing in what we know to be a deeply inequitable and racially structured university setting transform how students build their sense of identity, voice, and community? How can these writing classes change and contribute in meaningful ways to students' lives and the work they will do in and with their current and future communities? This chapter examines how each Asian American Studies program has redefined what it means to teach academic writing in the university. I examine how several Asian American Studies writing instructors have created ethnic studies writing pedagogies that have brought different forms of racial justice into being in university composition classes. I argue that these initiatives have not only led to important advances within the programs themselves, but have also generated new models that show how academic writing can challenge existing racial power structures in traditional composition programs. By refusing to distance themselves from the historical, economic, and social realities that systematically exclude and subordinate communities of color in and outside of the academy, the instructors in each program have been able to build strong foundations so that their students can use writing as a

314

vehicle for social change. Their work, in other words, provides a critical look into what it means for writing programs to invest their resources in the deep knowledge, experiences, and actions of students of color rather than in the production of learning outcomes. By giving students the space and support to figure out how writing is relevant to their lives, these two programs demonstrate what it means for writing to become a political project for personal and social transformation rather than what James Lee (2004) describes as a rhetorical tool to be deployed only when (or in order to be) in safe proximity to whiteness. As such, this chapter offers UC Berkeley's and San Francisco State's Asian American Studies writing classes as case studies of innovation and advances in the teaching of academic writing. These programs have successfully reimagined academic writing as a political project that works towards racial justice. They are examples for university writing programs to consider in relation to their own work — ones that open up space to consider what is possible if writing programs were to take seriously the largely unrecognized contributions that Asian American Studies programs have made for the past five decades. Composition studies and Ethnic Studies writing classes currently still operate within the legacies of the ideological, administrative, and methodological divisions that emerged between these two fields in the late 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s; however, the Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies writing classes at UC Berkeley and San Francisco State give a glimpse into what could be possible if the two fields were to collaborate consistently and if university composition programs were to begin redesigning their programs and writing classes using the ethnic studies principles and ethnic studies writing pedagogies that have long shaped Asian American Studies writing classes.

"Atrophy on the Vine": Subject A, SANSE, and the Overlooked Contributions of UC Berkeley's Asian American Studies Program to Academic Writing

315

The importance of the contemporary reading and composition courses designed by and housed in UCB's Asian American Studies program must be understood in the contexts of the changing demographics of Berkeley's student population in the 1970s and 1980s and Subject A's ongoing struggles to design writing classes that were sensitive to the linguistic, cultural, economic, and racial backgrounds of its student populations. During this time period, UC Berkeley saw steady increases in the number of Asian American and Asian immigrant students in its undergraduate population. In the fall of 1980, nearly 5,000 Asian American or Pacific Islander students were enrolled at the campus, with these numbers projected to increase to 7,000 students — which would be 30% of the anticipated student population — within the next five years (Chan, 2005a, p. 69). The visible presence of more Asian and Asian American students on campus was accompanied by anti-Asian racism that took several forms: this included a call for caps on the number of Asian American students admitted to Berkeley, as well as administrative and faculty concern about the low SAT verbal scores of admitted Asian students (Chan, 2005b). Nearly half of the Asian and Asian American student population in 1981 were students who had been born in foreign countries, and a breakdown of SAT verbal scores of the incoming class of 1981 by country of birth indicated that over 40 percent of students born in China, 65 percent of students born in Korea, and 69 percent of students born in Vietnam had scored under 400 (Stanley, 2010, p. 118). This was well below the cutoff score of 550 that students needed to pass out of the Subject A requirement. Administrators used these low SAT verbal scores as justification to place Asian and Asian American students into English as a Second Language (ESL) courses, which, by the late 1970s and 1980s, were housed within UC Berkeley's Subject A program and taught by ESL faculty under the title of "Subject A for Non-native Speakers" (SANSE). Due to the high numbers of Asian and Asian American students who failed to meet the cutoff score of 550, the SANSE courses were largely filled with students of

Asian ancestry, including immigrants, refugees, and international students (Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and Subject A for Non-Native Speakers of English, 1989).

The fact that the SANSE program served an almost exclusively Asian and Asian American student population during a time when they also faced increasing hostility and racism on campus was not lost on Asian American faculty and students. They began to complain once again as they had done in the late 1960s about the racist structure and pedagogical approaches of the Subject A and SANSE classes and programs. In January of 1988, the 1987-1988 undergraduate member of the Committee on Undergraduate Preparatory and Remedial Education (CUPRE), Colleen Lye, called for CUPRE to look into complaints about racial insensitivity in both Subject A and SANSE. Lye noted in her report that CUPRE needed to launch a thorough investigation into the "inordinately high fail rate in SANSE," the "heavy weighting of grammatical errors when grammar is not formally taught," SANSE's failure to "abide by the university's affirmative action policy," and ongoing problems with the "placement, administration, instructors, instruction and curriculum" in SANSE (Colleen Lye, as quoted in Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989, p. 5-6). Lye's concerns were echoed a year later by the Advisory Committee on Asian American Affairs (1989) in its report on Asian Americans at Berkeley, which was the culmination of an 18 month study about the Asian American faculty, staff, students, and campus-community experiences at UC Berkeley. The advisory committee noted that while Asian American students made up 26% of the undergraduate student population, they comprised 70% of the students enrolled in SANSE (Advisory Committee on Asian American Affairs, 1989, p. 9) and yet did not have an educational environment in these courses that actually addressed their linguistic needs or their experiences as Asian American students at a predominately white campus. Among the advisory committee's concerns included the lack of faculty diversity in SANSE, a lack of "sensitivity to the ethnic and cultural diversity" of the Asian American students enrolled in SANSE courses, and the lack of

317

appropriate resources needed to help Asian American students gain facility with English (Advisory Committee on Asian American Affairs, 1989). The advisory committee offered several recommendations detailing how the Berkeley administration could increase cultural awareness on campus, strengthen the school's affirmative action programs, and ensure that accessibility and equality were prioritized in the admissions process. The committee specifically emphasized in its report that the Subject A and SANSE programs should focus on diversifying their faculty and building learning environments that would be supportive of Asian American students and sensitive to their language acquisition needs.

While the Advisory Committee on Asian American Affairs was studying Asian American experiences on campus, the university also formed the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and Subject A for Non-Native Speakers of English. The ad hoc committee was charged with studying how well Subject A and SANSE were preparing students for "competence in reading and writing necessary for entering the freshman composition sequence" (Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989, p. 6). In June 1989, a month after the advisory committee submitted its report on Asian Americans at Berkeley, the ad hoc committee issued a summary of its findings in what became colloquially known as the Faulhaber Report. The final report addressed larger questions about the efficacy of Subject A and SANSE and the viability of moving this requirement to the university extension program or to a local community college. However, it framed these questions within the context of the ongoing complaints about the racist pedagogies, evaluation criteria, and curricula in Subject A and SANSE that disproportionately affected the Asian and Asian American students who were placed in these courses. In effect, the real question motivating the study was one of race and whether Subject A and SANSE were "adequately addressing the particular needs of minority students enrolled in their programs" (Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989, p. 6). The Faulhaber Report documented several problems with the Subject A and SANSE programs that

318

were similar to the findings of the Advisory Committee on Asian American Affairs, including the lack of minority faculty in the programs, racial and ethnic insensitivity, and "a general perception of culturally-biased assignments, tests, and placement procedures" (Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989, p. 24). Yet, the ad hoc committee stopped short of declaring that these programs were structured in racial dominance despite evidence that structural racism was a persistent and pervasive feature embedded into the programs' administrative and pedagogical functioning. Instead, the committee argued that it "could find no evidence to support a claim that any member of the Subject A and SANSE Programs discriminated against or was prejudiced toward students *because* of their racial or ethnic identity" and maintained that "none of the information presented to the Committee bears out the contention that there are systematic and willful problems of racial and ethnic insensitivity in the Subject A and SANSE Programs" (Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989, p. 22-23). As such, the committee ultimately chose to dismiss the evidence presented in student interviews, survey responses, and Lye's report to CUPRE by deeming them as aberrant occurrences and thus not "generalizable" (Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989, p. 23). Members of the committee set forth a series of recommendations for strengthening the campus's writing and ESL program that failed to discuss race, and instead proposed restructuring Subject A and SANSE into a new, combined unit that would operate under the oversight of senate faculty members from other departments who would serve as directors of the writing program on a rotating basis. The intent behind this restructuring was to remove the stigma of remediation from both programs: by creating a new unit that would blend ESL and writing instruction together and give senate faculty more control over the writing program's direction, the university could presumably eliminate the problems associated with placing immigrant, refugee, and international students into separate writing classes while simultaneously using the rotating senate faculty directorship to align writing instruction with the

disciplinary practices of the campus's various departments. The ad hoc committee conceded that the writing program needed to diversify its teaching staff through faculty recruitment efforts, diversity and sensitivity training sessions, and the introduction of multicultural curricula. However, its reorganization plan failed to acknowledge, much less attempted to dismantle, the racist ideologies and pedagogical practices that had long structured the Subject A and SANSE programs and their treatment of students of color. This was an oversight that even CUPRE noted with concern in its response to the Faulhaber Report findings (Committee on Undergraduate Preparatory and Remedial Education [CUPRE], 1989).

The ad hoc committee's refusal to acknowledge the racist architectures of the Subject A and SANSE programs was telling, especially considering that the study had been commissioned because of anti-Asian racism and high failure rates among Asian and Asian American students. These were the same problems that had caused Asian American students and instructors to raise complaints against Subject A twenty years earlier. Throughout its final report, the ad hoc committee relied heavily on the expertise and commentary of David Bartholomae, one of the two external reviewers of Subject A and SANSE. The committee used Bartholomae's commentary to explain the rationale behind its recommendations for program restructuring and to reframe the charges of racism against Subject A and SANSE so both programs would be absolved from blame. Bartholomae rightly expressed concern with UC Berkeley's definitions of remediation, which he believed led to the consistently high percentages of students who were held for Subject A throughout the writing requirement's 65 year history (Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989; Stanley, 2010, p. 129). Yet, he addressed the specific charges of racism and cultural insensitivity towards students of color in the writing program by positioning Subject A as one of the few programs on the campus that was willing to discuss and introduce students to race and multicultural texts. According to Bartholomae, Subject A was in fact a campus *leader* when it came to discussing race in the U.S. precisely because, unlike other

departments, it dared to discuss race. As such, Bartholomae maintained that the complaints of

racism that students of color and Asian students in particular had filed against Subject A should

be seen as the expected byproducts of what he described as "exemplary" practices and difficult

topics of discussion in the Subject A classroom. Bartholomae's (and by extension, Subject A's)

analysis of Subject A's presumed expertise on and ability to discuss racial issues sensitively is

worth quoting at length here:

> I suspect the Subject A course is one of the few places on campus where racial issues are
> openly discussed. The curriculum directs students' attention specifically to questions of
> racism and bias. Students read works by minority writers. And, of course, the classes
> have much greater minority representation than most classes on your campus. What you
> have, I think, is a healthy situation. Subject A is one of the few places where racial issues
> are routinely discussed. (In most courses, there is no opportunity to discuss racism in the
> curriculum or the institution.) When these matters come forward, classes become risky
> places. We are not very good at having these discussions: there is a greater chance for
> expression of overt racism (I saw none of this in the charges) or for people to step on
> each others' toes (as when one of the Subject A faculty recommended that his student
> speak English rather than Spanish outside of class as a way of working on English). The
> Subject A staff seem sensitive to these issues and seemed concerned to work out a
> classroom language that would not simply repress racial difference. I found their concern
> and their practice exemplary. If there is a problem, it is the general problem of American
> racism and it is coming to a head in the Subject A classes. (Bartholomae, as quoted in Ad
> Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989, p. 25).

Nowhere in the Faulhaber Report or in its use of Bartholomae's commentary about

Subject A did the ad hoc committee discuss the extensive work the Asian American Studies

program had done over the past twenty years to redesign and reconceptualize academic writing

in the spirit of the Third World Liberation Front's demands and political visions. The linguistic

racism and cultural insensitivity in the SANSE and Subject A programs that Asian American

students faced in the 1980s were arguably extensions of the same forms of racial subordination

that had compelled UCB's Asian Studies and Afro-American Studies programs to redefine

academic writing as a political project in self-determination and liberation in the late 1960s and

early 1970s. Yet, neither the committee nor Bartholomae acknowledged the existence of the

Asian American Studies program's writing classes or the social and political impacts these classes

had on students at Berkeley. Instead, the committee's and Bartholomae's analysis positioned Subject A, SANSE, and what would become the new College Writing Programs as the skilled experts in race and writing pedagogy, thus ignoring the rich histories and groundbreaking ways in which the Asian American Studies writing courses had changed how students of color at Berkeley talked about race and redefined academic writing. By overlooking the long history of racial tensions between Asian American Studies and Subject A as well as the Asian American Studies program's ongoing fight to design and maintain control over its own writing classes, the ad hoc committee could thus continue to ignore Subject A's and SANSE's ongoing failure to address the systemic racism in their programs. The subsequent restructuring of the university writing and ESL programs into the newly formed College Writing Programs in the early 1990s reflected this disconnect. The College Writing Programs were widely recognized for their work in dismantling the stigma of remediation by combining the "remedial" Subject A requirement with the first half of the university writing requirement into a combined, 6-unit course; however, the program's move away from remediation and its decision to hire an Asian American lecturer with a PhD in rhetoric and composition (Stanley, 2010) did not necessarily dismantle the racist disciplinary practices, ideologies, or teaching pedagogies that students of color at Berkeley had found so problematic. In fact, the move to restructure writing instruction at UC Berkeley was driven by an administrative interest in *maintaining consistent standards* of writing instruction across all departments. The ad hoc committee believed it could achieve this by designating the new College Writing Programs as the center of future efforts to align the teaching, assessment, and grading practices of all reading and composition instructors on campus with the College Writing Programs' own practices (Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE, 1989; Committee on Undergraduate Preparatory and Remedial Education, 1989). Although the long history of student complaints against Subject A and SANSE indicated that the programs' pedagogical and evaluation criteria put students of color and Asian students in particular at a

disadvantage, the ad hoc committee and CUPRE concluded that faculty from other reading and composition programs on campus would benefit from undergoing formal pedagogical and assessment training with the College Writing Programs faculty. CUPRE justified its decision by arguing that the College Writing Programs' standards and methods "enabled grading practices in Subject A and SANSE to be on the whole more reliable than those in many Reading and Composition courses" (Committee on Undergraduate Preparatory and Remedial Education, 1989, p. 18). The administration's decision to ignore the new teaching methodologies that the Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies programs had developed reflected the university's ongoing investment in reproducing what the Ethnic Studies programs knew to be deeply racist and inequitable pedagogical and disciplinary practices in academic writing. The university's commitment to removing the stigma of remediation from their writing classes was a critical step forward in recognizing the dangers of placing multilingual students and students of color into classes like SANSE where their likelihood of failing was high, but they missed a critical opportunity to learn from the expertise of programs like Ethnic Studies and Asian American Studies. UCB Asian American Studies writing instructors had already moved away from remediation in 1971 when they designed the Asian Studies 3A-3B-3C course sequence and disassociated remedial work from their writing classes in response to Subject A's racist ideologies (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971). For twenty years, they had been doing the difficult work of reconceptualizing what it meant to teach academic writing so they could enrich students of color's lives and help them understand how to identify, analyze, and respond to social and political problems in their communities and society. The university's decision to focus its efforts on the newly created College Writing Programs kept the Asian American Studies program's political writing project and ideological innovations at the peripheries of campus writing instruction while reprioritizing traditional writing standards and assessment practices.

The number of publications that document the UCB Asian American Studies program's work around writing instruction in the 1970s and 1980s is not extensive, but the few that exist beyond the archival materials presented in Chapter 2 of this dissertation offer important insights into how Asian American Studies reading and composition instructors brought new ways of conceptualizing writing to the university. After Elaine Kim designed the Asian Studies division's original three-course sequence, Colin Watanabe, who was also a writing instructor in the same program, wrote and published an article about the division's writing sequence in 1971. In his article, Watanabe (1971) argued that Asian American students' linguistic acquisition and verbal forms of expression needed to be understood in the context of their cultural and social backgrounds. He identified family structure and expectations, cultural practices, and instructor stereotypes of Asian American students as key factors that influenced how Asian American students engaged and expressed themselves in classroom settings. At the time that Watanabe's work was published, it provided one of the first focused examinations of the importance of situating Asian American student performance in academic writing classrooms within larger social and cultural contexts and reflected the division's rationale for radically transforming the ideological frameworks of its academic writing courses. Elaine Kim's (1978) analysis of reading and writing in higher education, which, like Watanabe's work, was based on her experiences working with Asian American students in writing classes at Berkeley in the late 1960s and 1970s (Chan, 2005c), introduced the argument that American media and literary stereotypes of what she called "Asian English" played a critical role in shaping how Asian American students perceived their own work as English speakers and writers. The racism underlying the popular media and literary portrayals of Asian Americans either as hyperbolically fluent in English or reduced to uttering what Kim describes as "alingual" English (Kim, 1978, p. 323) meant that these two characterizations of "Asian English" were always tethered to the notion of Asian Americans as either "devious, cunning, subtly evil, and inscrutable," or "faceless, subhuman …

almost incapable of human speech" (Kim, 1978, p. 323). Both stereotypes, according to Kim, fueled the assumptions that Asian Americans were incapable of mastering the English language and put Asian Americans in the difficult position of either being perceived as threatening if they were overly skilled at English or sub-human if their mastery of English was perceived as inadequate. These assumptions were then used by employers and those in positions of power to justify the economic exploitation of Asian Americans. Kim maintained that in both cases, Asian Americans were trained to believe that they would always be outsiders to the English language (p. 324). The accumulated effects of being subjected to these linguistic stereotypes through literary representations, economic subordination, and the overemphasis on grammar and mechanics in academic writing courses meant that Asian American students either became silent as they internalized dominant perceptions about their use of English, or they began to reject their cultural histories and identities as they attempted to assimilate to dominant linguistic norms. To Kim, the failure to account for the sociohistorical contexts and structural racism that shaped Asian American experiences both in and outside of the classrooms had led to the creation of so-called "solutions" in classrooms that were as damaging as the stereotypes and outdated linguistic theories from which they emerged. In her analysis of the ongoing structural failures in education and society that affected Asian Americans, Kim made the following call to action, arguing for the need to prioritize Asian American self-determination and cultural identity over the racist fixation on mastering grammatical form:

> "Solutions" based on traditional linguistic theories fail to take into account the sociohistoric factors which have shaped, and still shape, the Asian American experience. Certainly it is vital that immigrants learn English, not only as a stepping stone to better jobs, but also as a tool with which to fight more effectively for their rights. But it is also vital that schools cease to impel Asians towards an abandonment of their racial and cultural identity at the price of attaining "good English." It is vital that teachers and counselors discard their well-worn stereotypes of the Asian American as student and prospective employee. And it is vital that Asians be permitted to make their own decisions about their own education, rather than relinquishing those decisions to the white majority. Finally, it is vital that language not be accepted as the primary determinant of socioeconomic status. Cosmetic programs based on mythical learning

handicaps will never solve problems that are institutionally engrained in American society. (Kim, 1978, p. 332)

Kim's (1978) and Watanabe's (1971) respective articles, which were the first to document the need for writing instructors to account for and respond to the sociocultural and sociohistorical factors that shaped Asian American students' language development, later became key resources for Sucheng Chan. In 1981, Chan decided to teach a writing class in the UCB Asian American Studies program after observing many students in her introductory Asian American history and Vietnamese history classes struggle with basic analytical reading and writing skills (Chan, 2005c). Chan had originally offered several weeks of intensive reading- and writing-based tutorial sessions for her students because of her concerns about the work her students were producing. The tutorials led to such substantial improvements that Chan was compelled to begin a more formal study of the written work and academic performance of Asian American students in a writing class in order to see whether Kim's and Watanabe's original theories about Asian American student writing were still relevant given the changes in student demographics at UC Berkeley since they had published their articles (Chan, 2005c).

Chan's work with students in her reading and composition class deviated substantially from the non-mechanics-based approach to writing that Watanabe (1971) and Kim (1978) had advocated for in their publications and that had also structured the Asian Studies division's original visions for academic writing in 1971. Her reflections about the assignments and teaching approaches she used in her composition class reveal that Chan was interested in helping students become proficient in both oral communication and written communication. Unlike Kim and Watanabe, however, she achieved this by spending substantial time correcting students' pronunciation, grammar, and word usage by having students analyze their written form extensively at the sentence and paragraph level through what she called "editing sheets" (Chan, 2005c, p. 103). Her strategies for helping students learn how to self-edit their own sentence

structure were early versions of what composition and ESL instructors now refer to as sentence-level error checklists that help students independently track, find, and correct error and argument development patterns to build self-reliance. While Chan focused on the very mechanics-based approach to writing and grammar that Kim (1978) had warned contributed to the internalized linguistic racism and eventual silencing of Asian American students, Chan's class still offered students several important opportunities to think about and practice academic writing in ways that moved away from dominant norms. Chan structured the course content so that students could analyze their language acquisition experiences through the lenses of culture, racism and discrimination, socioeconomic status, gender, and history. This gave Asian American students in the class the chance to use their first-hand knowledge and experiences to analyze critically the theoretical frameworks and arguments that Berkeley faculty and administrators were using to assess Asian American students' verbal and written skills. Chan's (2005c) description of her students' responses to the various published theories and arguments revealed that students used their personal experiences and interviews with their friends and family to build far richer insights and more complex analysis of their language histories and writing experiences than those found in the theoretical frameworks laid out by notable scholars or in the later findings of the Ad hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE in 1989. Through Chan's (2005c) careful documentation of her students' conversations and research, we learn, for instance, that her students believed many of the difficulties they faced with writing stemmed from their lack of familiarity with the topics they were supposed to be writing about in their composition classes rather than from language proficiency difficulties. They argued that their immigration histories and that refugees' family placement histories had shaped their language acquisition experiences, and that their experiences with discrimination and racism were thus far more complex than they believed Kim's (1978) work accounted for. At every turn, students used their and their colleagues' personal experiences to challenge the generalized assumptions underlying

327

academic theories about language acquisition. In doing so, they also exposed Chan's own assumptions about what it meant to teach Asian American students how to read, write, and analyze critically. Chan's experiences working with these students compelled her to develop a proposal that year (Chan, 2005d) in which she argued that the campus needed to move away from teaching ESL-only classes such as those offered in SANSE, which she argued fueled language discrimination by decontextualizing and reducing language acquisition to mechanics. In her proposal, she instead advocated for an interdisciplinary approach to teaching English language that would integrate the teaching of course content within different disciplines with language acquisition, study skills, disciplinary conventions, and critical analysis to challenge language discrimination. Chan believed that this approach more appropriately reflected the situated realities of how students learned as well as the complex relationship between language, analytical skills, and disciplinary content (Chan, 2005d). In doing so, her proposal directly challenged the decontextualized deficit model of ESL instruction. Chan (2005d) argued that these efforts should be led by ladder-rank faculty, as teaching reading, composition, language acquisition, critical thinking, and analytical skills were foundational parts of their responsibilities as educators, researchers, and experts in their disciplines. Though quickly rejected by English and ESL instructors at the time who were upset with Chan for "infringing on their turf" and "indirectly questioning their teaching methods" (Chan, 2005d, p. 81), Chan's proposal anticipated the need for a campus-wide shift to integrating reading, composition, ESL, study skills, and discipline-specific content instruction eight years before the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Subject A and SANSE published its report and recommended that the College Writing Programs be created. In short, Chan's work around reading and composition offered a critical look into the rich possibilities for teaching, learning, and reconceptualizing academic writing that emerged when a writing class centered the students' lived experiences, knowledge, and ways of learning as the basis of their work and research for the class.

In order to understand the significant contributions that the UCB Asian American Studies program has made over the past fifty years towards reconceptualizing academic writing, it is critical to know the long history of the Berkeley administration's and the university writing program's pattern of ignoring the Asian American Studies program's work. Whereas Subject A, SANSE, and the College Writing Programs struggled to recognize that their methods for teaching academic composition consistently put students of color and Asian American students at a disadvantage, the Asian American Studies writing instructors generated critical analysis throughout the 1970s and 1980s to expose the problems with language acquisition theories and to highlight the importance of situating Asian American student literacy within larger sociocultural and sociohistorical contexts. Their analysis not only revealed how linguistic stereotyping and racial discrimination against Asian immigrants and Asian Americans silenced Asian American students and led them to internalize racist stereotypes, but also exposed that linguistic racism was symptomatic of deeper systemic problems in society that needed to be addressed. They recognized that mastering English grammar alone would never fix these problems, and as such, redesigned composition classes so they could help students build the skills, knowledge, and values they would need to identify, understand, and solve urgent problems in their communities and in society. The Asian American Studies program saw the potential of writing classes to become a space where students could learn history, analyze issues that were relevant to themselves and their communities, and thus be positioned to contribute to material and social change. Unlike their colleagues in Subject A and SANSE who believed students needed to master mainstream disciplinary forms and practices and who pressured students to erase their cultural, racial, and multilingual identities, the Asian American Studies writing instructors specifically designed their writing classes to challenge the ideological and ethical premises of these pedagogical approaches, even as they acknowledged the need for students to learn disciplinary fundamentals to survive and for self-advocacy. They instead sought to build

329

academic writing classes where students could "see the value and joy of sharing themselves with others" as they learned their histories, and where writing could be a site of personal and social transformation (UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division, 1971, p. 23).

This is not to say that the Asian American Studies program's work was perfect. While its proposal in 1971 was originally designed as a collective response to the racist ideologies and perceptions about students of color that Subject A reproduced, Kim acknowledges that at some point the entire Asian American Studies program (herself included) and particularly the Ethnic Studies department "all suffered from contamination by 'deficit' ideas about education of students of color" (Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020). Over the years, the program's writing sequence and early advocacy efforts did help to save many students from being subjected to the white supremacist ideologies and racist practices in Subject A that disproportionately affected Asian American and Asian immigrant students (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). However, later faculty-led efforts in the program to "help" students of color with their writing were still shaped at times by the deficit belief that "students [in Asian American Studies] needed to be brought up to the light, to learn white Americanness" (Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020). Faculty could gain favor with university administrators and reintroduce remediation into the Asian American Studies writing classes by insisting that students perfect their grammatical form and reproduce disciplinary conventions, even as they allowed students of color to share and use their lived experiences to comment on discrimination, racism, and language acquisition. The Asian American Studies writing classes thus created divisions within the program itself between writing faculty who distanced themselves from the politics of the 3A-3B-3C course sequence by reinforcing grammatical precision and traditional disciplinary frameworks, and those faculty who, in the spirit of the original 1971 proposal, tried to move away from remediation altogether by teaching writing as a political project. These deficit-based pedagogies and perceptions about

students of color's education reflected the ongoing difficulties faculty faced in maintaining the Asian American Studies writing courses' original visions and politics within a university system that was still invested in reproducing dominant ideologies and standards. Yet, despite these challenges, the Asian American Studies program and writing instructors still consistently offered critical analysis, timely interventions, and politicized alternatives to how academic writing was taught on the rest of the campus. The Asian American Studies writing instructors named and challenged the racist ideologies in traditional composition courses and language acquisition theories while centering students of color's rich knowledge, lived experiences, and cultural backgrounds as the foundation for critical inquiry. They regularly reenvisioned and developed new models for teaching and reconceptualizing the work of academic writing, putting their ideas into practice years — often decades — before the university's administrators and writing programs realized they needed to follow similar paths. Their critical analysis of the racist underpinnings of academic writing at UC Berkeley not only anticipated the directions academic writing programs needed to move in, but also offered examples of how to teach academic writing as a political project that could contribute to political and social change. In its best moments, the Asian American Studies program's writing courses changed how students understood the work of academic writing and became a vehicle through which students of color could take control of their education and futures. In these ways, the Asian American Studies writing instructors were arguably already doing the work that Asian American and Asian immigrant students demanded of Subject A and SANSE in the 1980s.

Contemporary Writing in Asian American Studies at UC Berkeley: Building a Sense of Self and Voice Through Literary Analysis

Even after UC Berkeley established the College Writing Programs and changed how academic writing was structured on campus, the Asian American Studies program continued to

offer its own reading and composition courses. The Asian American Studies program's writing classes have evolved over their fifty year history with the different instructors who have taught the classes and in response to various administrative directives. Yet, the innovative visions, critical analysis, and new theoretical foundations that the Asian Studies division laid out when it first developed the 3-course writing sequence in 1971 have continued to shape the program's writing classes. Although the Asian American Studies reading and composition classes are not necessarily as visible on campus as the now well-established College Writing Programs, they continue to redefine the work of academic writing in the lives of students of color and challenge conventional notions of what it means to teach academic writing and for what purpose.

In the 1990s, the reading and composition classes in Asian American Studies at Berkeley established themselves as courses that were meant to help students of color develop a sense of their identities and the value of their voices. While the Asian American Studies writing instructor (she/her/hers) who taught these courses over the next two decades had a formal background in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), her writing teaching pedagogy was primarily influenced by her literature and Ethnic Studies background, as well as by her experiences as a participant in the Bay Area Writing Project (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). BAWP is a collaborative, instructor-led organization in the Bay Area that promotes innovative approaches to teaching writing across all grade levels, disciplines, and schools through professional development workshops during the summer and academic year. Its guiding philosophy is that instructors must write themselves in order to learn how to teach writing: once instructors write and reflect about their own writing processes, they will be positioned to look at student writing thoughtfully (Bay Area Writing Project, 2020). Since its creation in 1974, BAWP has helped instructors build their teaching pedagogies and writing skills through narrative writing across all subjects and disciplines. For the

Asian American Studies writing instructor, BAWP played a key role in her ability to see that writing was personal and about the self, which then shaped how she began to teach her reading and composition classes. Through her experiences with BAWP, she saw that, like narrative writing, strong analytical writing required a strong voice, a clear point of view, and passion. As a result, she began to teach Asian American Studies writing classes at Berkeley with a commitment to ensuring that students would be able to write about issues that were important to them, that would allow them to build their voice, and that would give them the space to write about what they felt was of value (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). Unlike traditional literature and composition classes that focused on Eurocentric literature that the writing instructor knew students could not relate to, she structured the course around the study of Asian American literature and other ethnic literatures so students could learn about the cultural contexts, histories, and narratives that they identified with and were interested in. This would then allow the students to engage in their own forms of analysis in meaningful ways. Her belief that writing was about the self and that analytical writing could thus be taught through narrative also distinguished the work and goals of her class from traditional composition classes when it came to issues of grammar, form, and mechanics. Whereas most writing and literature classes still operated under the assumption that academic writing was about mastery over sentence-level structure, she maintained — even despite her TESOL training — that students needed to move away from the problematic assumption that using "Standard English" was the only acceptable way to write (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). For the Asian American Studies writing instructor, this long-held belief in academia problematically clung to Western notions of what counted as acceptable writing and stigmatized errors in ways that were not only detrimental to students' sense of self, but which also failed to open opportunities for students both to study

issues and build analysis that were authentic to their experiences (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019).

In a move that deviated from traditional writing classes and turned conventional approaches to teaching academic writing on their heads, the Asian American Studies lecturer thus chose to structure her class around the study and analysis of Asian American and ethnic literature rather than academic writing in order to give students the space to build their analytical skills and sense of voice when reading about issues that were important to them. To this end, she changed how students were expected to read literature. Unlike conventional literature or writing classes where students read only 40 pages of the book at a time and engage in decontextualized interpretations in piecemeal fashion, the Asian American Studies writing instructor did not assign students a specific set of pages to read in advance of the course lectures or discussion sections. Instead, she encouraged students to read all of the books assigned for the class in their entirety at the start of the semester. This empowered students to come to lectures and discussions already having done their own situated analysis of the texts and allowed them to spend the semester learning to how to *reread* texts in full in order to analyze and interpret the literature (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). Students thus were encouraged in their Asian American Studies writing class to engage immediately in the kind of conceptual and contextualized analysis of literature that is possible only when discussing a book after having read it in its entirety. This approach to teaching "full books" rather than discussing only specific, assigned chunks of the books meant that students did not have to rely on the instructor to do the analysis for them or to accept the single interpretation of the literature presented in lecture: by the time they came to the lecture, their discussion sections, or were doing group presentations about a specific book assigned to the class, students would have read the book at least two or three times. This practice of rereading and analyzing books in context completely transformed what it meant for students to

334

read, analyze, interpret, and write about issues that they felt were important. It allowed them to engage in discussions with passion, context, a point of view, and purpose (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). Students could engage in literature and discover issues that resonated with them through the process of constantly rereading and recontextualizing the literature throughout the semester and as they reconsidered it in dialogue with their peers. The writing instructor noted that through this structure, students would invariably begin making connections on their own: they would link the literary analysis they were doing in lecture with what they independently felt were the most salient historical, political, and social contexts necessary to understand and appreciate the complexities of the literature (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). Rather than passively listening to or simply accepting the instructor's analysis or ways of situating the literature, students brought their own interests and interpretations to their discussions and rereadings of course texts and helped to build the historical and cultural contexts that they believed were most relevant and critical for understanding and interpreting these works (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). In this sense, while class lectures and discussion sections provided semi-structured spaces through which students could engage with course content and test their interpretations, students ultimately had the freedom to become the drivers of their own methods for analyzing and interpreting literature: they could and often found ways not only to make the material immediately relevant to them, but also to discover how to use the literature and their analysis to make history, experiences, and theory come alive.

It is important to note that, despite the heavy emphasis on literary analysis during the lecture and discussion portions of the course, the Asian American Studies writing instructor did not formally teach or give lessons about academic writing during lecture despite assigning three formal papers (including one research paper) throughout the semester with multiple drafts

required for each. Instead, she specifically chose to focus on writing instruction during private writing conferences with students instead of during official class time. This is a practice that is largely unheard of in traditional academic writing classes where significant portions of class time are devoted to reviewing and practicing foundational writing, organizational, and sentence-level skills with the entire class through formal lessons and peer review activities. While the tutorial-based approach to teaching writing may have been unconventional if done in the context of a traditional university writing program, it reflects the fact that the writing instructor saw her writing classes in Asian American Studies as more than a class that would help students build specific skill sets around the form, structure, and mechanics of academic writing. Instead, the class was one that prioritized students of color's ability to read about, analyze, and write about issues that were relevant to them, that reflected their histories, and that allowed them to bring their real life experiences and research into their analysis of literature. The primary goal of this class, in effect, was meant to help students build the understanding that what they had to say and write about was valuable: by grappling with and making sense of the issues and histories that resonated with them, they could construct analysis and make meaningful connections that would be useful to themselves and others (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). Writing itself was certainly an important vehicle through which students could express themselves and communicate their points of view, but for this instructor, the conference-based approach to teaching writing in Asian American Studies indicated that writing "skills" as traditionally defined by university composition programs and learning outcomes were not necessarily the most critical part of the course. They were simply one part of a much larger and more ambitious project to help students build their sense of self-identity, their voice, and projects that mattered to them (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019).

Elaine Kim's reflections about the early UCB Asian Studies Division's work in the early 1970s offer crucial insights into why it is so important that the contemporary Asian American Studies writing instructors continue their efforts to see and teach academic writing as a political project. She reminds us that at the time students and graduate student instructors at Berkeley were fighting to design and control their own writing classes within Ethnic Studies in the late 1960s and early 1970s, there was a heavy emphasis in literature classes on analyzing literature through formalism and New Criticism. These were the schools of literary theory that maintained that texts could be analyzed and read solely through close-readings of form, structure, genre, and literary devices without ever having to contextualize literature in their social, historical, political, or cultural contexts (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). To Kim, this practice of decontextualizing literature was racist: one could not talk about ethnic literature without talking about the histories of colonization, power, and racial inequities that these books and poems documented and from which they emerged (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). As she taught the early reading and composition classes in the Asian Studies division, Kim focused on having students read and critically analyze literary criticism. She wanted to help students understand not only why the literary critics may have made these interpretations, but also why and how their failure to situate these close-readings within their appropriate social and historical contexts often led to racist analysis. To Kim, this process of having students contextualize literature in Asian Studies writing classes was invaluable. It pushed students to ask critical questions so they could begin discussing the real meaning of issues, events, and interpretations and so they could grapple with the contexts, histories, and points of view that needed to be understood in order expose what the literature was really doing (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). Over the past two decades, reading and composition lecturers in Berkeley's Asian American Studies program have tried to continue the work that Kim and her colleagues began. Their ongoing efforts to redefine the work of academic writing

by prioritizing students' voices and by always contextualizing literature within their relevant social, political, and historical contexts speak to the fact that traditional writing and literature departments *have still not fully grasped the significance of or need for these approaches*. As Harvey Dong points out, if reading and composition was taught in Asian American Studies at Berkeley like it was in other departments, why would students be taking writing classes in Asian American Studies (Dong, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019)? Until the end of the 2016-2017 academic year, the Asian American Studies program had regularly offered six reading and composition courses per year and an additional section during the summer session, each of which served anywhere from 18 to 31 students per class with full enrollment in each section (Berkeley Academic Guide, 2020). As literature and traditional university writing programs continue to push for form- and genre-based writing instruction, their insistence on holding fast to the very methods for analyzing and writing about literature that Kim argued in the early 1970s were fundamentally racist reflects the urgent and ongoing need for the work that Asian American Studies writing classes continue to do over fifty years later. The Asian American Studies program continues to recognize that writing is only one part of a much larger and complex effort to challenge structural racism and to build new possibilities that center students and communities of color, their histories, and their voices. The program's writing classes continue to be a space where Asian American students and students of color can situate literature within the historical, political, and lived contexts they believe are crucial for challenging racism and for understanding the experiences of Asian American, Chicanx, African American, and Indigenous communities. In these ways, the writing classes in UC Berkeley's Asian American Studies program do much more than simply teach students how to write: they put into practice the belief that students' ability to build their voices, their political consciousness, and their understanding of Asian American history through contextualized analysis of literature, history, and narratives are essential for their lives and future work.

"Who Are You Serving?": Institutionalization and Continuing the Work of Academic Writing in UCB's Asian American Studies Program

While the UC Berkeley Asian American Studies program has continued to challenge many of the constraints and premises of disciplinary conventions and frameworks in academic writing over the past fifty years, its fight to redefine the work of academic writing is ongoing and must be understood in the context of the Ethnic Studies department's long history of both resisting institutionalization and also becoming increasingly and perhaps inevitably institutionalized itself over the years. When the Collins Committee issued their review of the Ethnic Studies Department in 1973, their report called for several changes to the department that L. Ling-Chi Wang (2019) argues "challenged the department's founding principles of autonomy, educational relevance, and solidarity among racial minorities" (p. 102). Among the Collins Committee's recommendations, which sought to align Ethnic Studies with the ideologies and practices of traditional academic units, included the following: that faculty no longer be given the authority to recommend faculty appointments; that each program in Ethnic Studies become its own department and be housed in the College of Letters & Science; that the department (and the Contemporary Asian American Studies program in particular) reduce or completely eliminate its offerings in community studies; and that students no longer play a role in decision-making processes within the department (Wang, 2019, p. 102). Although the Ethnic Studies faculty rejected the committee's recommendations in an attempt to continue building the department under its founding principles, by 1974, the Ethnic Studies department slowly started to become more institutionalized and over time began to move closer in line with the Collins Committee's original recommendations. In December 1973, the African American Studies program made the unexpected decision to move into the Division of Social Sciences in the College of Letters and Science as its own department. This move had detrimental impacts on

the rest of the Ethnic Studies programs. With the African American Studies program's departure came a loss of solidarity among the programs as well as subsequent budget cuts that, along with the departures of the original TWLF strikers who had by this time left the university, left the Ethnic Studies programs vulnerable to institutionalization despite their ongoing efforts to reestablish the original visions for a Third World College and to stay committed to their founding principles (Dong, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). As the department put together a strategic and long-range plan to ensure its survival, it slowly began to build a new comparative ethnic studies curriculum and a path to tenure for faculty. Wang (2019) notes, however, that these advances came at the expense of community studies, which was largely eliminated from the department's course offerings, and at the expense of the department's autonomy over hiring and retaining faculty, which was now dictated by university criteria. The ensuing changes to the faculty makeup meant that the department's and individual programs' remaining ties with the communities were nearly all lost as the newly hired tenure-track faculty in Ethnic Studies had no connections to the department's original visions or to the communities the programs were meant to serve. As a result, departmental priorities and interests soon shifted (Wang, 2019).

For the Asian American Studies program's reading and composition classes, the loss of community studies and community languages from the Ethnic Studies department's curriculum was particularly significant. Kim (Participant Interview, February 1, 2020) notes that the original efforts to create non-racist reading and composition classes in the early Asian Studies division were structured around the recognition that community languages such as Cantonese, Japanese, and Tagalog were critical for bringing non-racist writing into being: if students learned community languages, read and respected literature written in these languages, and began to recognize the importance of community languages in people's lives and identities, then they could begin to challenge and dismantle the existing language hierarchies in academia and writing

classes that privileged Standard English and suppressed community languages (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). All program offerings in the division were thus designed around the belief that when students had the opportunity to learn languages such as Cantonese or Tagalog, they could then study Chinese or Filipino literature and write about these texts and histories, which would then position them to begin doing work in Chinese or Filipino communities (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). As the spaces where students would first be introduced to Asian American and Third World literature and begin doing the kind of critical and historical analysis that would expose structural racism both in and outside of the academy, the early Asian Studies division's reading and composition classes were, according to Kim, thus inextricably tied to community languages and were essential to preparing students to work in the communities from which Ethnic Studies and Asian American Studies had emerged (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). With the loss of these two foundational elements of the Ethnic Studies department and the Asian American Studies program in the mid-1970s and 1980s, the Asian American Studies reading and composition classes were not immune to the slow institutionalization of Ethnic Studies, even as they continued to distinguish themselves from mainstream university writing courses and made vital contributions both to the teaching of academic writing and to the lives of the students of color who enrolled in these classes.

Over the years, budget cuts and shifting priorities among the programs, faculty, and the university itself have changed the role of reading and composition classes in the UCB Ethnic Studies department. During budget crises, the university has historically encouraged students to take reading and composition courses at local community colleges in order to fulfill the university writing requirements rather than investing in the existing writing classes on campus (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). The Ethnic Studies department's reading and composition courses have thus been the first to be eyed for elimination during budget crises in order to make room for other content courses and faculty

hires, which is due in part to the university administration's failure to give the department credit for offering "service" classes (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). When the UC administration downsized the Ethnic Studies programs in the mid-2000s into one department with a consolidated budget and staff, faculty in the other Ethnic Studies programs pressured Asian American Studies to cut their reading and composition classes and to divide the funds so the three programs could have equal budgets (Kim, Participant Personal Communication, October 31, 2020). However, the Asian American Studies faculty, who, in the spirit of the Ethnic Studies department's founding principles, still believed in and were committed to *service to students,* continued to retain and prioritize their writing classes for as long as they could, even as the other Ethnic Studies programs began to move their curriculum in other directions (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). Through the end of the 2016-2017 academic year, Asian American Studies regularly offered seven reading and composition courses per year (including summer sessions) that would allow students to read Asian American, African American, Chicanx, and Native American literature while fulfilling both the first and second halves of the university writing requirements (Berkeley Academic Guide, 2020). However, two years after the retirement of the Asian American Studies writing instructor who had taught these classes for over twenty years and who had also trained and hired writing instructors for all other Ethnic Studies programs, the Asian American Studies program reduced its writing course offerings to only two per academic year[2] and eliminated its summer composition class offerings entirely (Berkeley Academic Guide, 2020). Though once seen as essential for dismantling the racist language hierarchies in traditional university writing programs and for preparing students to serve their communities through the study of community languages, ethnic literature, and immigrant histories, the reading and

---

[2] The two writing course offerings now include one section in the fall semester to fulfill the first half of the university writing requirement, and one section in the spring semester to fulfill the second half of the university writing requirement.

composition classes that the Asian American Studies program fought to establish are now arguably at risk of being lost altogether. With the declining number of writing sections offered each year and the decision to transform what used to be the program's sole full-time writing faculty position into a part-time position staffed either with lecturers hired at only 40-80% time (Berkeley Recruit, 2019, 2020) or with current Ethnic Studies graduate students who have been promised teaching positions in their funding packages, the political project of the Asian American Studies writing classes has largely been subsumed by budgetary priorities.

Dong reminds us that the democratic origins of the Third World Liberation Front's strike for the College of Ethnic Studies meant that the Asian Studies division originally looked to the students and community for reflection; however, as both Ethnic Studies and Asian American Studies became increasingly institutionalized over time, they lost their connection with the origins and founding principles of Ethnic Studies and instead began to look to the institution and administration for reflection and validation (Dong, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). The core question that he poses is "*Who are you serving*?" (Dong, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). While much of this chapter has focused on the history of what the faculty members in Asian American Studies were able to accomplish over a period of fifty years, Dong's question — "*who are you serving?*" — makes visible the importance of remembering to look to students for reflection in assessing the future of reading and composition in Berkeley's Asian American Studies program: what are the students interested in learning about and doing, and how can both faculty, the Asian American Studies program, and the Ethnic Studies department meet those interests so that students can build the tools and knowledge they need to do this work? What role can reading and composition courses in the Berkeley Asian American Studies program continue to play in facilitating students' personal and professional growth as they consider the work they want to do in the world? Dong and other faculty who have taught Asian American Studies reading and composition courses over the years have noted

that students choose to fulfill their writing requirements in the Asian American Studies program instead of in other departments for a reason (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019; Dong, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). If we fail to listen to *why* students choose to come to Asian American Studies, what they gain from these courses, and how these courses shape them, we run the risk of losing not only the classes and the students themselves, but also the immense opportunities for transformation and change outside of academia and in the community that students' experiences and politicization in these writing classes make possible. Such oversights have long-term consequences that even the university writing programs themselves, including Subject A, SANSE, and the College Writing Programs, have historically failed to recognize. Kim (Participant Interview, February 1, 2020) describes the impacts of this transformative work as follows: "There are many people who went through our 20AC class (our history class) or our reading and comp class who may not have majored in Asian American Studies and they may not be teaching Asian American Studies, but they became *conscientized*." She likens the ways that these classes created generations of people who were politically active in various ways to the veterans of the Third World strike who "tried to put their politics into practice in other ways" and who always tried to "operationalize their politics in their work," whether they became MUNI bus drivers or worked with the department of public health (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). In these ways, the real work, legacies, and future of the UC Berkeley Asian American Studies program and its reading and composition classes are arguably to be found in the students themselves as they build their political consciousness in their Asian American Studies writing classes and make decisions about how they want to put their politics into action in the world and in their communities.

Seeing Students of Color in Academic Writing Classes at San Francisco State University

344

It is critical to understand both the overlooked work of UC Berkeley's Asian American Studies writing classes and the program's ongoing fight to shape the direction of academic writing on campus. Yet, the unique forms of resistance and isolation that the Berkeley Asian American Studies program has faced from administrators and mainstream writing program faculty do not necessarily reflect the experiences of other university Ethnic Studies departments that have similarly taken steps to design their own academic writing classes. Although it is not uncommon for Ethnic Studies writing classes to emerge in response to the racist standards and colorblind pedagogies in mainstream university writing programs, there are examples of Ethnic Studies writing faculty who have managed to find ways to work productively with their campus writing programs despite their ideological differences. These faculty have learned how to take the best elements of composition pedagogy and apply them within an Ethnic Studies and racial justice framework. This section examines the history of San Francisco State University's (SFSU) writing classes in the College of Ethnic Studies, and specifically within the SFSU Asian American Studies department. This case study reflects how an unexpected but productive collaboration between writing program administrators and an SFSU Asian American Studies faculty member transformed writing instruction at SFSU and in the College of Ethnic Studies. The section is based on an in-depth interview with Wei Ming Dariotis, an Asian American Studies professor who has not only taught Asian American Studies writing classes at SFSU, but who also worked closely with SFSU's first writing program director to design new writing courses on campus. Through her story, we can see the central role that Dariotis and the College of Ethnic Studies have played in changing how students experience academic writing at SFSU and how faculty across the disciplines teach academic writing. Dariotis's path to becoming an Asian American Studies professor and her experiences both teaching and reconceptualizing how to teach writing in Ethnic Studies illustrate the ongoing ideological and methodological divisions between mainstream composition studies and Ethnic Studies. Yet, her work and efforts to

collaborate with faculty across the disciplines and especially within SFSU's composition program also speak to how Dariotis was able to navigate these divisions in ways that did not necessitate the total abandonment of what composition's disciplinary norms had to offer. Rather, they opened opportunities for Dariotis to learn from and challenge these norms simultaneously so she and her colleagues could design new ways of teaching writing using principles from composition studies and an Ethnic Studies writing pedagogy framework.

Asian American Studies as a Path to Teaching Literature and Composition in Asian American Studies at San Francisco State University

Elaine Kim, Harvey Dong, and the UCB Asian American Studies program's writing instructors have highlighted the importance of looking directly to the students who take their Ethnic Studies classes for reflection (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019; Dong, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019; Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020). By understanding what the students are gaining from these classes and what *they* see as the real work of Ethnic Studies, Kim, Dong, and others have been able to stay true to the democratic and community-based founding principles of Ethnic Studies. This practice of turning to the students for reflection is critical for understanding the origins and ongoing development of academic writing classes in the College of Ethnic Studies at SFSU. The unexpected trajectories that students' professional lives take and what they bring to their work as a result of studying and applying their knowledge of Asian American histories, literature, and politics can change the way that academic writing is taught. Wei Ming Dariotis's own experiences reading and studying Asian American history and literature not only changed her professional trajectory, but in fact laid the foundation for her eventual contributions to and ongoing reformulations of the academic writing classes that the SFSU College of Ethnic Studies and Asian American Studies department now offer today.

Dariotis's journey to becoming a professor in the SFSU Asian American Studies department was one that began in an Ethnic Studies class she had not expected to take. As a literature major, Dariotis had originally planned to study medieval English literature and to become a medievalist scholar; however, her interests began to shift after taking a course taught by Shawn Wong, one of the original editors of *Aiiieeeee*. Dariotis recalls that a friend initially had to drag her to this course, but it ultimately ended up changing her life (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). Dariotis became Wong's research assistant and worked with him on projects for the Before Columbus Foundation (2020), a nonprofit organization that Wong was the president of at the time that promoted and distributed culturally and ethnically diverse American literature. Although she had already been accepted to graduate school at UC Santa Barbara in medieval English literature, the experiences that Dariotis had through her work with Wong and through meeting Asian American writers such as Frank Chin, Li-Young Lee, and Jessica Hagedorn led her to realize when she began her graduate studies at UCSB that she no longer wanted to be a medievalist. Instead, she began taking mostly Ethnic Studies classes from that point forward. Over the next four years, she studied extensively with Elliott Butler-Evans, an African American literature scholar, and also took all of the undergraduate classes in Asian American Studies that she could, essentially completing a BA in Asian American Studies and completing her PhD coursework in English at the same time. She wrote her dissertation on Asian American literature, but Dariotis's coursework, training, and research throughout her PhD program prepared her to be a specialist in both African American and Asian American literature.

While in graduate school, Dariotis was able to build her teaching skills in different fields, which would become important years later when she began applying for adjunct and full-time teaching positions. When she started her PhD program, for instance, she was immediately hired as a teaching assistant for introductory undergraduate literature courses in her department, and in her second year was hired to teach undergraduate composition classes — an experience that

she described as "sink or swim" due to the lack of training and professional development support for the graduate student instructors teaching the class (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). In fact, it was not until she began working as a writing tutor in UCSB's tutorial center that Dariotis finally received formal pedagogy training and was able to gain experience working individually with students on their writing. Although she had decided that she wanted to teach in Asian American Studies programs rather than in English programs as she was writing her dissertation, Dariotis spent several years "freeway flying" as an adjunct in English traveling between Foothill College, Sonoma State, and Santa Clara University before being hired as an adjunct at SFSU to teach a Filipino American literature class in the Asian American Studies department. Later on, she was hired to teach the department's mixed heritage class. As Dariotis was finishing her PhD, she learned that the SFSU Asian American Studies department was looking to hire a new faculty member. The job description the department wrote was an unexpected combination of seemingly disparate skill sets and areas of expertise, which included Asian Americans of mixed heritage, Asian American literature, composition, and more. Dariotis's extensive experience both researching and teaching Asian American literature, composition classes, and mixed heritage classes made her an ideal candidate for the position. She was offered the job at SFSU in 2000 after finishing her PhD.

Asian American Studies 214: Academic Writing in SFSU's Asian American Studies Department

Well before Dariotis arrived at SFSU, the SFSU Asian American Studies department had established its own second-year composition course, Asian American Studies 214. These second-year composition classes were largely taught through the English department, but the four sections of this class that were not owned by the English department were housed in Asian American Studies, African American Studies, Raza Studies (now Latina/Latino Studies), and

Business. The business department needed their own writing classes to address and teach the specialized skills of their discipline, but the remainder of these specialized writing classes were created as a result of "a knowledge that our students were not being well-served in the English department courses because they weren't really being seen" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). The English curriculum's Eurocentric focus as well as the implicit bias and overt racism of some of the instructors meant that SFSU's Asian American students were not being well-served in these classes (Dariotis, Participant Personal Communication, November 2, 2020). Recognizing the need to take action, the Asian American Studies department developed its own writing class to address these problems and to build something that would be more relevant to their students: "Many years before I got here, they [the Asian American Studies department] realized that they needed to have a course that was just focused on Asian American issues, literature, whatever so our students could see themselves reflected in the stories they were reading and the themes that they were writing about" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). When she was hired in 2000, Dariotis inherited Asian American Studies 214 from Jeffrey Paul Chan and began to reconceptualize how she would teach the course. Given that the department already offered six different literature classes, including Introduction to Asian American Literature, Chinese American Literature, Japanese American Literature, Vietnamese American Literature, Asian American Children and Teen Literature, and Asian American Women's Literature and Art, Dariotis knew that "thematically, I didn't just want to reproduce one of our Asian American literature courses." Instead, she decided to develop a gender studies class designed to address many of the issues that were not covered in the existing curriculum, including Asian American men's issues, examining feminism from a man's perspective, queer Asian American Studies issues, and more. Although many of Dariotis's students did not necessarily choose Asian American Studies 214 because of the course topic or theme and did not even realize until the first day that the class would focus on gender studies and queer Asian

American Studies, Dariotis found that by the end of the semester, many students were identifying with and enjoying the literature.

An important part of Dariotis's work in Asian American Studies 214 was trying to figure out how to teach composition effectively. While her work as a writing tutor at UCSB's tutoring center had given her formal pedagogical training in the teaching of academic writing, she struggled to find resources for students that explained the writing process and that also guided students through it. Like most composition instructors, she regularly received composition books from publishers that each offered different techniques for teaching writing, but felt that few of them explained the writing process in ways that would guide students effectively as they were working on their Asian American Studies 214 papers. It is important to note that at this point, few composition resources written by writing faculty in Ethnic Studies departments existed: like Kim's (1978) and Watanabe's (1971) publications on academic writing in Asian American Studies, these Ethnic Studies resources either did not offer practical recommendations for explaining and teaching academic writing processes, or, like the tutor handbook that Sau-Ling Wong had compiled for the UCB Asian American Studies 6A-6B-6C series, were internal to university departments and writing faculty (Asian American Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1975). Since many of the mainstream composition handbooks commonly used in university writing classes were structured more as reference manuals than as guides, Dariotis recognized that they had limited utility for students who needed help conceptualizing and understanding how to build and work through each stage of the writing process. She initially used texts in her class by Diana Hacker, whose many books (including *A Writer's Reference* [2019], *Rules for Writers* [2020], and *A Pocket Style Manual* [2017]) were and continue to be assigned widely in entry-level composition courses. Eventually, Dariotis began to work with *A Sequence for Academic Writing* (Behrens & Rosen, 2017). She chose this book "because of the way that it narratively broke down not only a sequence for academic writing, but in particular the way it

broke down summary, paraphrase, and quotation — triangulating those three things and explaining why and when you would use each open in different circumstances" (Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). Dariotis recalls that this book offered both her and her students the kind of clarity around how to think about and build arguments in context that they were seeking. At the end of the semester, her students would tell her, "'I'm going to use this book when I go to grad school' or 'I'm going to use this book …' because there was a way it helped you think through the writing process that I hadn't experienced in other ones" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). In these ways, Dariotis was able to design a class that not only addressed issues and readings that would allow students of color to see themselves in the curriculum, but that also managed to connect these topics and the teaching of academic writing to more mainstream writing resources. In doing so, she ensured that her students would have the tools they needed to develop their writing skills in the course itself and after they left the class.

SFSU's Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement: Collaborations Between Mainstream Academic Writing and the College of Ethnic Studies

Dariotis's experience teaching the 214 composition class in Asian American Studies was the start of her ongoing involvement in campus-wide initiatives to transform writing instruction on campus, which ended up shaping her own work and pedagogical approaches as a writing instructor. When SFSU decided to move away from its long-standing Junior English Proficiency Essay Test (JEPET) after receiving the recommendation from an external review committee to do so, Dariotis became involved with the campus's Writing Task Force. This task force was charged with taking the external review committee's analysis and developing new academic writing policies for the campus. She also served on the hiring committee for the first writing director at SFSU, an experience that she said "taught me a great deal because we got to see all of

351

these wonderful master writing instructors" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020).

One of the major revelations that came from Dariotis's time on the hiring committee was the realization that it was not productive to correct students' writing — something that Dariotis had been doing for several years since beginning to teach Asian American Studies 214. Given the intense, 4-4 teaching load at SFSU, which often meant that she was teaching two composition classes per semester with 25 students in each section, Dariotis had by this point developed injuries from commenting extensively on student papers, which she states stemmed from "thinking it was my job to edit students' writing by hand" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). At the time, SFSU had gained the reputation of being "known for poor writing," but Dariotis and her colleagues did not know at the time how to respond to students' work in ways that would be helpful for the students and an efficient use of the instructors' time. The corrective approach to grading student papers was a pervasive practice among Dariotis's colleagues at SFSU, and many found themselves, like Dariotis, spending full days responding to student work. Although she and her colleagues had set time limits on the number of minutes they would spend commenting on each student's paper, the high volume of papers from their writing intensive courses meant that it was impossible for them to grade sustainably or effectively. Dariotis also understood that, structurally, students at SFSU did not have sufficient support in writing despite taking a first-year writing class, second-year writing class, and third-year class. Because of her experience teaching writing, Dariotis made sure that all of her classes were writing-intensive so her students could continue building their skills. But for the majority of students whose only writing-intensive classes during their time at SFSU might be their three required writing courses, Dariotis maintained that these three classes were "not enough — not enough writing instruction, but also not enough time spent writing" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). According to Dariotis, the lack of sustained reinforcement of writing instruction and writing-intensive coursework in the majority of classes across disciplines

stemmed from the high teaching load for faculty, high enrollment caps for each class, insufficient tutorial services, and little time for faculty to meet individually with students on a regular basis to support their writing development.

In an effort to address these structural problems and to find a replacement for the JEPET, the writing task force decided to create Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) courses. These writing classes would be housed within the different disciplines instead of in the English department, and students would take these courses instead of the JEPET in order to fulfill the upper division English proficiency requirement at SFSU. Dariotis recalled that getting the campus on board with the new policy for the university GWAR requirement in each discipline "was a tough battle" and required extensive outreach to faculty. She and the new writing program director led this massive undertaking together: "I had to go with the newly hired writing director, Mary Soliday, around to all the campus. We went around and around and around, convincing people that this [GWAR] was going to be better. And everybody's response was, 'I can't teach writing. Are you crazy?'" One faculty member, for instance, who met with Dariotis to discuss the proposed policy said to her, "'I can't teach writing to our students. *My students' grammar is broken*. You don't understand. The students I have in my class, their grammar is broken'" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). Dariotis found herself in the position of having to explain to instructors that students did not have a "grammar problem," but that they were instead facing writing challenges "because they're not understanding how to write in the context of what you're trying to have them communicate." It was a revelation to the faculty and campus community to learn through their conversations with Dariotis and Soliday that it was impossible to "teach grammar as an independent object" because it needed to be taught in the specific context of the discipline in which students were writing. Faculty also were surprised to learn that the real task at hand in writing classes was not actually to teach students grammar. Dariotis and Soliday had to help faculty understand that their responsibility under this

353

new writing policy was instead to "teach them [students] writing that's relevant in your discipline" — something the faculty were already qualified to do because they were doing this kind of writing themselves in their own research. She and Soliday would teach the faculty *how to teach* students these forms of writing. In order to support faculty as they developed GWAR courses for their disciplines, Soliday was able to secure funds to create a GWAR instructor working group. Members of the working group were given course release so they could spend an entire semester working with each other to create new writing classes for their departments. They shared resources and recommendations, helped each other to troubleshoot, and developed materials together. Dariotis was a member of the first GWAR instructor working group.

Developing GWAR courses was challenging, particularly for disciplines like math where the department did not necessarily have an existing course that could easily be turned into a writing class that met the requirements for GWAR. While the Department of Asian American Studies already offered its own composition class, Dariotis noted that the College of Ethnic Studies itself did not have an existing class that could be redesigned to serve the entire College: "Although my department was probably big enough to have our own GWAR course, we decided as a college to support the whole college because American Indian Studies would never have enough majors to float a whole course. So we decided to create a college-wide Ethnic Studies course" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). Dariotis started a committee with representatives from Asian American Studies, Raza Studies (now Latina/Latino Studies), Black Studies (now Africana Studies), and American Indian Studies in order to develop the College's GWAR course. Upon sharing the syllabi from the Asian American Studies 214 classes, the committee realized that what had worked for individual writing classes within each department would not be enough for GWAR. Dariotis thus developed a survey that asked faculty in the College to explain what writing tasks their students needed to be able to accomplish and what writing tasks students were already doing. The results of this survey would serve as the

foundation for designing a new GWAR class for the College of Ethnic Studies. Dariotis

describes the committee's findings as follows:

> What emerged was really fascinating to me because there was some categories that I just
> assumed was going to be there, like research papers. I kind of thought that was mostly
> what it was going to be. But it turned out to be there were three categories. One was all
> the stuff related to writing research papers: annotated bibliographies, rough drafts,
> outlines, that kind of stuff. I called this one "writing for academic empowerment." The
> middle category was something I kind of knew but hadn't consciously realized: "writing
> for personal empowerment." That was a lot of coming to their own voice, where a lot of
> us were doing short poetry exercises in class as a way to help them free their voices. But
> then they were also needing things as mundane as a cover letter and resumes and those
> types of things. It's strange to put poetry and resumes in the same category, but it made
> sense — writing for personal empowerment. The third category completely caught me
> by surprise. That was things like op-ed pieces, letters to the editor, mission statements,
> vision statements, manifestos. We'll call those "writing for community empowerment."
> Those three sections became the pillars for our GWAR course in the College of Ethnic
> Studies. (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020)

The College's GWAR course was unique not only in its three-pronged approach to the

teaching of academic writing, but also in the ways that it had both emerged from and was able to

make new work and collaborations possible within the College. According to Dariotis, for

instance, the GWAR class design, which had emerged from the expertise and contributions of

all faculty from each department in the College, was the only class in the College and likely in the

entire campus that had been designed with this amount of collaboration between departments.

As a result, "it was also the only course in our College where students from the different

disciplines — Asian American Studies, African American Studies, Latina/Latino Studies,

American Indian Studies, and Race and Resistance Studies — can come together and talk to one

another and are also learning about each others' experiences" (Dariotis, Participant Interview,

February 10, 2020). The GWAR course also became the only class in the College that focused

on educational equity and social justice. Students would spend the first two weeks of the

semester reading the works of writers of color who talked about writing and the role that

writing played in transforming their lives and in saving them: they read pieces by Langston

Hughes and Audre Lorde, Gloria Bird, as well as the work of Asian American lesbian writers

who wrote about their experiences of reading Audre Lorde. Dariotis emphasized that, in this sense, the first unit of the class did not just focus on the individual experiences of writers of color reflecting on what it meant for them to write. It also encouraged students to grapple with what Dariotis described as the "inter-ethnic influences and connections in writing" and opened space for students to reflect on the damaging effects on people of color of having to write in English. The second unit of the course focused on the historical events and laws that have created and reinforced educational inequities that directly target or disproportionately impact communities of color. Students learned about laws designed to prevent African Americans from being allowed to read or write and read about American Indian boarding schools. They studied how segregation in the American education system was experienced by Chinese Americans and learned about the creation of the Chinese School in San Francisco's Chinatown. In addition to considering how Japanese internment interrupted Japanese American students' education, students spent time learning how Dreamers experience the intersection between immigration and education. They studied educational inequities in the context of the prison industrial complex, and also examined how SFSU's Project Rebound has created a matriculation path to SFSU for people who are formerly incarcerated. After completing the first two units, students then had the opportunity to work on their own research project related to educational equity in their discipline or area of interest.

Over the past ten years, Dariotis has both informally and formally coordinated the College's GWAR course. In her role as GWAR coordinator, she has been responsible for helping to guide faculty teaching the class for the first time. Due to the intensive workload of the course and the heavy workload of full-time faculty at SFSU, the Ethnic Studies GWAR course has commonly been taught by lecturer faculty whom Dariotis maintains are just as qualified to teach the class as tenure-track faculty because they have extensive experience teaching composition in different contexts. While there has been increasing consistency in the lecturer faculty who have

been assigned to teach the course over the years, this was not always the case. In anticipation of the need to train and guide new faculty regularly, Dariotis created an iLearn@CMS template course when she and the College first designed the class. Over the past ten years, this course template has served as a foundation for the GWAR course structure. As part of their training with Dariotis, faculty who teach GWAR have been given access to the course template and thus can use the template if they choose to while also having the freedom to introduce new materials and readings so they can develop the course as they wish. To further support their work and to expand the number of people who can teach the GWAR course, Dariotis has designed a series of worksheets on writing genres and topics that help instructors to understand what these genres of writing are, how they are relevant to Ethnic Studies, and sets of steps or processes that instructors and students can follow in order to develop their own applied version of the genre. Among the worksheets are topics like how to write a haiku, how to write a mission/values/goals statement, how to write a manifesto, how to write a life legacy, and more. While many of the genres that the worksheets cover are common to mainstream reading and composition classes or to Ethnic Studies classes, others have been derived from personal experiences or conversations with students that Dariotis has had over the years. These conversations have revealed how daily interactions and forms of communication between faculty and students are in fact closely tied to essential writing tasks. A student's complaints about the course, for instance, led Dariotis to develop a worksheet on how to write grade disputes, while having to write an obituary for a family member led her to develop a worksheet on how to write obituaries as a form of personal and community empowerment. In addition to the resources she has created for the GWAR course specifically, Dariotis has also created writing resources for the College of Ethnic Studies that are available for her colleagues from the College's different departments to use as they develop their own classes. The goal is that, like the creation of the GWAR course, the ongoing task of developing writing resources and worksheets for GWAR and for the College will be a

357

collective effort so that different faculty members can both design and share resources with the rest of their colleagues. However, this has not yet come to pass. Faculty do not always realize or remember that the writing resources Dariotis has put together over the past ten years exist and are readily available for their use. However, in her current role as the faculty director of SFSU's Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CEETL), Dariotis now has more opportunities to share resources with her colleagues, to conduct trainings, and to work with her colleagues as they learn how to use the resources that are available.

One of the most important tasks that the College's GWAR writing instructors have faced has been helping students to heal the negative experiences they have had with academic writing. Dariotis noted that students often come to her class with complicated histories and experiences with writing, all of which become central to the work of the class for the remainder of the semester. She attempts to create opportunities for students not only to begin discussing and challenging dominant assumptions about what "counts" as "good writing," but also to find ways to reclaim academic writing for themselves. Dariotis described how students in her GWAR class have thus been able to transform as writers over the course of the semester: students who had initially been unable to produce any writing in her class because they had been subjected to years of negative messages about their academic abilities found themselves easily able to produce multiple pages of writing during in-class assignments by the end of the semester. Bilingual speakers who explained things in class using constructions that would not have been used by "native speakers of English" were validated in the class as Dariotis helped students understand that new and unexpected ways of using language were important and insightful because they taught others to see language differently. Rather than developing punitive grading rubrics that reproduced racist ideologies, students had the opportunity in the Ethnic Studies writing classes to co-create assessments and to build what Dariotis describes as relational assessments rooted in the concepts of community that are foundational to Ethnic Studies. With

358

these co-created assessments, students had the chance to articulate what they felt they needed to be taught, what they were able to do with support from their instructor and classmates, and what they were able to teach. According to Dariotis, the point of this class has never solely been to reproduce mainstream composition practices and their accompanying dominant ideologies about language, knowledge, or what counts as "good writing." Instead, it has been to help students build confidence, self-awareness, and pride in their work. In the process of doing so, students have been able to build alternative theories and practices of writing that empower them and allow them to see writing as a process that is relational, based in notions of community, and something they have a role in co-creating. In this sense, the College has encouraged students to rethink the work of academic writing *even as they continue to learn about and practice many of the mainstream genres of academic writing that fall into the Ethnic Studies GWAR course's "writing for academic empowerment" pillar.* As a result, students are able to reclaim academic writing for themselves as they rewrite mainstream narratives about language and transform how they approach writing for academic purposes with their new tool sets and community-based perspectives. By extension, the GWAR course also requires that the *faculty* teaching the course confront their own writing histories and rethink the conventional disciplinary frameworks that traditionally structure composition classes. Like the students, faculty are encouraged to reassess and reformulate their own work, assumptions, and philosophies as writers and as writing instructors. Dariotis describes this much-needed process of reflection on the part of faculty who teach GWAR as follows:

> The course was focused on healing the wounds of writing. Writing instruction, I think, is so geared towards correcting errors and also mastery, so instructors are feeling anxious because they cannot possibly master everything about English composition. They were taught in fear, and they somehow managed to get through it, but they still feel anxious and fearful and I think they pass that on to their students — that fear and anxiety. They become very punitive and they forget or they don't have time to focus on the positive aspects of their students' writing because they're so focused on correcting their errors. In the best mode (because I remember having this mindset as a young writing instructor), in your most positive moment, what you're thinking to yourself is, "If I don't correct that comma that's in the wrong place or that's missing and my student mistakenly believes that that's all right because I didn't correct it, when they go and write a letter for their job

or they make a report at work and their boss sees that error and thinks that they're stupid, I will have cost my student their livelihood." That's the most extreme kind of thinking that's underlying this. And so it's not like, "I need to pass along the punishment" — I don't think most writing instructors are thinking that way at all — but I do think that they haven't learned a positive way to teach writing because they're not taught that way, and they're fearful of failing to be masters of this impossible-to-master discipline. (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020)

For Dariotis, the experiences of teaching composition classes in Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies, co-creating the GWAR course with her colleagues, and supporting her colleagues as they teach writing classes have been critical to her growth as an instructor and to her current work in CEETL. Although she acknowledges that the College has not been able to have as much impact on writing instruction as they should because they have not yet generated enough publications about their work to reach a larger audience, she maintains that the writing faculty's direct work with the students in their classes continues to have immeasurable impacts on the personal lives of their students (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). One of Dariotis's students, for example, began the term unable to write in class due to their previously negative experiences with writing and school; yet, they left the class not only able to produce extensive amounts of writing, but also with an interest in becoming a teaching assistant for Dariotis's writing class. The student's experiences working as a teaching assistant and developing their own writing handouts for students inspired them to apply for graduate school, and they eventually became a high school teacher. For Dariotis, these personal journeys of healing and growth are the stories that reflect the critically important work that the College's writing classes and faculty do to reenvision the power and potential of writing in Ethnic Studies. While she and her colleagues recognize the need for students to become familiar with the academic genres that are tied to academic empowerment during their time at SFSU, they also see academic empowerment as more than simply the ability to reproduce the forms, structures, and logics associated with writing in the disciplines. Instead, they have designed ways to teach writing that help students to understand and challenge the damaging ideologies and frameworks

underlying academic writing tasks while also helping students to build their confidence and to develop their own ways of making writing a meaningful, empowering, and relational activity. In the College's writing classes, students have the opportunity to gain a sense of fulfillment from writing beyond the limitations of how the academy defines "success" in writing. They can instead see it as an activity that is deeply rooted in notions of the self and community.

At the beginning of the semester, Dariotis asks students to reflect on several questions in order to encourage them to think about what she describes as "the larger purpose of what writing can mean in their lives." Her questions include the following: "Why are you taking a writing class? Why do you need to improve your writing? Why do you need to improve your writing for you, personally, in your life? What goal is it that you want to achieve in your life for which writing better than you do now will be an aid?" (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020). As students continue to write and reflect throughout the semester, Dariotis encourages them to go back to these foundational questions to remind them that writing can become a practice that is not only relevant to their lives, but also one that they can use to articulate the visions they have for their futures and to bring these futures into being. For Dariotis, then, the real question that the writing classes in the College of Ethnic Studies and in the Asian American Studies department have given students the space and the tools to ask and answer during their academic journeys is, *"What is the legacy you want to leave behind, and how is writing going to help support that?"* (Dariotis, Participant Interview, February 10, 2020).

In Summer of 2020, Dariotis became the lead developer and lead facilitator of a new institute on campus — the Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) Pedagogies of Inclusive Excellence (PIE) in Online Teaching Institute. Known as the JEDI PIE Institute, the 25-hour institute offers SFSU faculty the opportunity to build anti-racist pedagogies and tools for addressing white supremacy in online teaching environments (Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning, 2020). Participants learn how to assess course assignments

and pedagogies with a critical race lens and also build understandings of how racism and white supremacy have been reproduced both structurally and individually in educational institutions. As they consider how their disciplines actively support the reproduction of racist and colonialist projects and pedagogies, participants design their own anti-racist and decolonial strategies to make learning engaging, inclusive, accessible, and equitable (Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning, 2020). To date, over 300 participants from different departments such as geography, music, museum studies, and more, have worked with the institute and reflected on steps they can take in their own teaching to break away from the racist and colonialist pedagogies and practices that structure the education system and their disciplines. The campus has quickly gravitated towards the JEDI principles and anti-racist pedagogies, which has created opportunities for increased collaboration between SFSU's Writing Across the Curriculum/ Writing in the Disciplines (WAC/WID) program and faculty like Dariotis who teach academic writing using ethnic studies pedagogies. Ever since CEETL incorporated SFSU's WAC/WID Program into their center, Dariotis has had the opportunity as faculty director of CEETL to collaborate and consult with SFSU's Writing Director, Juliana Van Olphen, and Associate Director, Jolie Goorjian, who have been designing a Writing PIE Institute and a Writing JEDI PIE Institute. Dariotis encouraged Olphen and Goorjian to consider whether it would be possible to help faculty learn how to teach writing without using JEDI and anti-racist pedagogies, which their original design for the institute — a Writing PIE Institute and a separate Writing JEDI PIE Institute — would have necessitated. As a result, Dariotis, Van Olphen, and Goorjian are now working together to redesign the Institute as a Writing JEDI Institute where faculty will learn how to teach writing using the writing pedagogies and ideas about writing instruction that originally emerged within the College of Ethnic Studies and the Asian American Studies department. Thanks to CEETL, the JEDI PIE Institute, and the collaborative working relationship between Dariotis, Van Olphen, and Goorjian, Dariotis notes that "these ideas about

362

writing instruction that were originally drawn from ethnic studies writing pedagogy are finally moving into the very receptive WAC/WID and Composition programs at SFSU" (Dariotis, Participant Personal Communication, November 2, 2020).

While Dariotis did not necessarily anticipate when she first enrolled in Shawn Wong's class that she would eventually become an Asian American Studies scholar and Ethnic Studies writing faculty member, one of the many legacies she and her colleagues have been able to create at SFSU as a result is a rich history of developing the GWAR course in the SFSU College of Ethnic Studies and writing pedagogies that reflect the principles and practices of ethnic studies. Dariotis's journey as a writing instructor has not been a lone effort. She notes that none of it would have been possible without the help and support of her colleagues in English Composition and English for Multilingual Speakers who not only helped Dariotis to realize she had been using deficit model pedagogies, but who also helped her to find and develop the tools and resources she needed to change her practices and design new pedagogies. Her colleagues Sugie Goen-Salter, Van Olphen, Goorjian, Crystal Wong, and John Holland have been instrumental to her growth as a writing instructor. Although Asian American Studies 214 may have originally emerged in response to composition pedagogies and curricula that did not serve SFSU's Asian American students, Dariotis's journey shows that she and her colleagues would not have been able to reenvision the work of academic writing in the College of Ethnic Studies and the Department of Asian American Studies without the guidance and support of SFSU's composition faculty and composition program. Their ongoing, interdisciplinary collaborations through CEETL and their collective, cross-disciplinary efforts to bring ethnic studies writing pedagogy to the WAC/WID and Composition programs through the new Writing JEDI Institute speak to the enormous potential for Ethnic Studies and composition faculty to continue transforming how the SFSU campus community understands the pedagogies and work of academic writing. Their collaborative work merges and puts into practice the most

empowering principles and writing pedagogies of both ethnic studies and composition studies so students can reclaim academic writing for their lives and futures.

Conclusion

The long history of academic writing instruction in the UC Berkeley Asian American Studies program reflects the ongoing challenges the program has faced both in its fraught relationship with the university writing program and in its tendency to be relegated to the periphery of composition studies. Over the past fifty years, it has made significant pedagogical, methodological, and conceptual contributions to academic writing on Berkeley's campus, and its faculty continues to identify and anticipate the urgent ideological and structural changes that composition programs need to better serve students of color. Yet, the Asian American Studies program's writing classes and its reenvisioning of composition as a political project have become increasingly invisible over time as both campus administrators and a new generation of faculty fail to recognize the value of the program's writing pedagogies, theories, and work. Although the UCB Asian American Studies writing faculty have consistently and powerfully demonstrated the necessity of working against the restrictions of conventional disciplinary frameworks and methodologies in academic writing classes, the campus has been reluctant to adopt the Asian American Studies program's antiracist ideologies and writing pedagogies. The administration's tendency to ignore the models and deep insights that already exist in its departments reflects the ongoing challenges that UCB Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies writing instructors will face as they continue their fight to serve the students.

Despite these difficulties, however, Berkeley's Asian American Studies writing classes have consistently offered important insights into how and why university writing programs must break from diversity, equity, and inclusion frameworks as well as traditional disciplinary practices. The UCB Asian American Studies program's refusal to treat the mastery of "standard" academic

364

writing skills as the ultimate purpose and value of composition classes, for instance, has been central in shifting the notion of what the real work of writing classes can and should be. For over twenty years, the program's writing classes have been a space where students are encouraged to prioritize an entirely different set questions and ways of engaging in course material. They can construct the kinds of analysis, histories, and interpretations that are crucial for challenging dominant frameworks not only in history and literature but also in writing. Questions such as "*What are the issues and projects that truly matter to me?*", "*What do my own experiences help to expose about these theories or interpretations?*", and "*What are the histories, perspectives, and lived experiences we need to know about in order to understand this issue or what this piece is doing in more complex ways?*" can expose the problematic assumptions underlying dominant ideologies across the disciplines. Asking and having the space to answer these questions helps students build new interpretive frameworks and methodologies so they can rewrite dominant narratives with the histories and voices that have historically been overlooked. In these contexts, what it means to write becomes much more than learning how to formulate a 3-level thesis statement, how to create a topic sentence, or how to stack arguments, evidence, analysis, and concluding sentences in paragraphs. Writing in these Asian American Studies classes becomes, first and foremost, finding ways to write about issues that will help students develop their sense of self and to understand the problems in their communities so they can make meaningful changes in society. With these tools and experiences, they can rewrite dominant narratives by recovering Asian American histories and overlooked lived experiences. They can begin writing with passion, a point of view, and purpose (Asian American Studies Writing Instructor, Participant Interview, November 26, 2019). These approaches demonstrate the UCB Asian American Studies writing instructors' hope that their writing classes will give students the space not only to become politically conscious, but also to find ways to transform their political consciousness and growing

understanding of identity into action in their work and communities (Kim, Participant Interview, February 1, 2020).

The three pillars of SFSU's Ethnic Studies GWAR course perhaps best demonstrate the recognition that writing necessarily encompasses more than the reproduction of disciplinary forms and logics: writing for academic empowerment, writing for personal empowerment, and writing for community empowerment demonstrate that the College of Ethnic Studies is committed to helping students reclaim academic writing for themselves. For the College, putting the community-based and relational principles and frameworks of ethnic studies into practice in writing classes can help students build the foundation for academic, personal, and community empowerment during their time at SFSU and beyond. As students from different disciplines and backgrounds come together in the College's GWAR classes to learn about each other's histories and experiences with writing and educational inequities, they simultaneously confront the challenges they have experienced under mainstream academic writing and begin to build the historical and analytical foundations needed to challenge and *rewrite* the dominant narratives and assumptions about their languages, histories, and writing. In these ways, even as they learn about the conventional genres and forms that structure writing in and across the disciplines, students are not expected to subscribe to the pervasive assumption that academic empowerment through writing depends on mastery of grammatical structures and disciplinary logics. Instead, their experiences and insights are validated, establishing a foundation with which they can begin to see how their languages, experiences, and writing styles can be used to work towards anti-racist and decolonial practices in education. When Ethnic Studies writing instructors like Dariotis make a concerted effort to invest in the extensive knowledge, experiences, and insights of their students, students not only begin to see and bring themselves into the curriculum, but also start to put new ways of writing into practice. Once students' histories and lived experiences are central to the work of the class, writing can no longer simply be a vehicle for individuals to advance

individually in the academy by reproducing disciplinary practices. It must necessarily respond to and reflect what students see as the most salient issues and priorities for their own empowerment and for community empowerment. The faculty in SFSU's College of Ethnic Studies have worked collectively to build writing classes and ethnic studies writing pedagogies to ensure their students can do this work in their composition classes.

The work and new opportunities that Ethnic Studies and Asian American Studies writing courses at UC Berkeley and SFSU have made possible thus far for students of color are not perfect. University administrators still have the power to set requirements for learning outcomes, define pedagogical priorities, and maintain exploitative labor systems that overwork and disenfranchise writing instructors. Ethnic Studies writing instructors also still find themselves in the position of having to follow administrative directives and disciplinary conventions for writing instruction while facing the reality that many of the students enrolled in their courses are there to fulfill what are still widely perceived as skills-based graduation requirements. Yet, in the face of these challenges, ethnic studies writing faculty are still committed to collaborating with their colleagues in university composition programs in order to build anti-racist writing pedagogies together across the disciplines. SFSU's writing faculty in the College of Ethnic Studies and in the WAC/WID and Composition programs have found ways to place ethnic studies principles, practices, and pedagogies at the center of their collaborative efforts to teach faculty how to teach writing. Their collaborations offer hope that ethnic studies programs will continue to push and work with their campus communities to reimagine and redefine the real work of academic writing. In always returning to the core questions of who these writing classes serve and who writing instructors should be looking to for reflection and validation, ethnic studies and Asian American Studies writing instructors at Berkeley and SFSU offer clear examples of what it means to reconceptualize the purpose and nature of academic writing instruction to serve the students and their futures.

Conclusion

In 1999, Min-Zhan Lu argued that the field of composition studies was in danger of becoming overly invested in reform at the expense of multilingual students, students of color, and low-income students. According to Lu (1999c), when compositionists taught academic writing as a technical skill and framed this as a form of code-switching that would give students more freedom to express themselves, students were left with a false sense that they did not have to choose between their values, home languages, and academic discourse. Under this accommodationist framework, academic discourse was presented as a neutral form that would allow students to express their points of view freely without having to change them. To Lu, however, the "neutrality" of academic writing under the field's prevailing narrative ignored the real work and politics of academic writing: unlike the dominant narrative, which presented academic discourse as a tool that could easily accommodate linguistic, cultural, and political differences because of its objectivity, Lu (1999c) argued that academic discourse was political and in fact always forced students to "re-position themselves — i.e., to re-form their relation — toward conflicting cultural beliefs" (p. 51) because language, discourse, and meaning always emerged from historical, social, and lived contexts that were steeped in power, conflict, and struggle (Lu, 1999a, 1999c). Since the 1970s, however, which marked the institutional emergence of Basic Writing, the field strategically connected scientific and technical objectivity to academic writing and discourse "as a means for neutralizing the politics of writing, teaching, and research at a time … when the dominant found issues of difference and power most difficult to contain" (Lu, 1999a, p. 56). At the time of her publication, Lu argued that the real work writing instructors thus faced was to move away from the prevailing perception that adopting academic writing as a purely technical skill would help students resolve linguistic conflict and struggle. According to Lu, instructors instead had to find ways of working productively with the

perpetual tensions between discourse and values that she believed were central features of both the field of writing studies itself and the generation of meaning in written form. Students had to learn that they would always be required to position and reposition themselves in relation to conflicting cultural and linguistic values within the university.

I write about Lu's argument at length because it makes visible many of the problems that the field of writing studies continues to face over twenty years later. Although the field has since come to recognize that it must evolve to serve the needs of underrepresented student populations, the diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives it has adopted have not necessarily changed the underlying logic of objectivity that continues to structure many of the field's foundational practices and frameworks. Writing programs have made concerted efforts to include equity as a part of their learning outcomes; however, as add-on initiatives that largely leave existing disciplinary practices and frameworks intact, equity and inclusion efforts within university writing programs have not forced compositionists to examine critically how the field's ideologies, standards, and skills continue to disenfranchise low-income students and students of color despite being presented as purely technical — and thus neutral — skills. This has meant that the learning outcomes themselves have largely remained the same. Under this model, students read and write about multicultural texts and topics and are rewarded for adopting practices that reproduce middle-class norms and functional literacy, but they are never pushed to examine how the "objective" genres and skills they are expected to master and reproduce in fact emerge out of specific historical, political, and social circumstances that have historically excluded students of color, low-income students, and multilingual students. Instead, the perceived neutrality of disciplinary practices and skills are seen as helping to facilitate equity and inclusion efforts because they putatively provide an objective tool that students can use to communicate freely about multicultural literature and race. The field has struggled to recognize that these approaches allow students to advance within the existing structure of the academy but

369

do not fundamentally change the established racial power structures or ideologies both in and outside of the field: just as reading and writing about racial oppression does not necessarily translate into material changes in racial hierarchies or the economic realities of the masses outside of the academy, the field's ongoing investment in presenting academic writing as a purely technical skill allows both students and instructors to ignore the ways that these practices have historically been used to promote assimilation, linguistic subordination, and racism. Within this context, then, both learning outcomes and equity and inclusion initiatives work together to extend the field's long history of neutralizing what Lu (1999a, 1999c) describes as the political conflict and struggle between students' rich ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds and the composition field's dominant discourses and standards.

Recent attempts within the field to address these limitations through threshold concepts, labor-based grading contracts, and culturally relevant pedagogy have opened important opportunities for instructors both to name the standards that have disproportionately impacted students of color in writing classes and to develop new teaching practices that recognize the important knowledge and insights that students bring to the classroom. Modifying pedagogical and assessment practices alone, however, is insufficient for achieving the kind of structural and ideological transformation that the field needs to serve students of color more effectively. Pedagogical transformation cannot be understood apart from sustained critical analysis of the institutional and disciplinary practices that have historically shaped academic writing in higher education and disenfranchised underrepresented student populations. This requires examining the ways that universities and the field itself are structured to reproduce racial disparities through their labor structures, learning outcomes, forms of assessment, standards, and disciplinary skills. Academic writing programs at the University of California, for instance, emerge from a long history of remediation where administrators used writing classes as gatekeeping mechanisms at the expense of multilingual and immigrant students who were

370

disproportionately held for remedial writing term after term, unable to advance until they were granted the "Oriental D" after they had fulfilled all other requirements for graduation. These courses also served the university's larger political and economic interests by allowing administrators to position the university strategically as an elite public school that served all students, while maintaining standards high enough to require a significant percentage of the student population — especially the university's Asian and Asian American students — to take remedial writing classes (Stanley, 2010). These histories demonstrate that academic writing programs, the skills they teach, and the critical role they play in advancing the university's larger political and economic interests are far from neutral and thus cannot be ignored when assessing and reformulating the field's teaching practices to serve underrepresented students. As neoliberalism increasingly structures higher education, composition instructors must now account for the ways that both these histories of racism within the field of writing studies as well as the market-based logics of economic efficiency continue to shape every aspect of the field in ways that often work to the disadvantage of the students themselves.

Writing instructors' efforts to situate their work in the classroom within larger political, social, and institutional contexts highlight the dangers of continuing to operate within the current institutional structure while also making visible new possibilities when they use these larger contexts to guide pedagogical change and challenge racial hierarchies. The work and critical analysis of FA, Alex, the UC Berkeley Asian American Studies writing instructor, and Wei Ming Dariotis illustrate that what is seen in the field as largely a pedagogical and curricular issue — the need for writing instructors to change their teaching practices and curricula to reflect the needs and histories of students of color — are also ideological, institutional, and labor issues that must all be accounted for in order to understand why and how students of color and multilingual students are continuously put at a disadvantage in academic writing courses. Their work demonstrates, for instance, that "neutral" teaching pedagogies and learning outcomes in

371

academic writing courses cannot be understood outside of the stratification of faculty labor in the neoliberal university, nor can they be understood outside of the teaching evaluation and merit review processes that have tied learning outcomes to the notion of "teaching excellence." As writing programs increasingly turn to adjuncts to meet their labor needs and use generic criteria and performance indicators to quantify what counts as "good" teaching, writing instructors face increasing pressure to use step-driven procedures and product-driven learning outcomes in their teaching in order to generate high evaluation scores — even if these methods do not meet the needs of students of color and multilingual students. By extension, the prevailing assumption within the field that academic writing skills are neutral enough to be applied widely across contexts overlooks the extensive work being done in other disciplines both in and outside of the academy that proves this is not the case: in disciplines where students are expected to design methodologies and analysis that are specific both to the contexts in which they are working and to the participants with whom they are working, the generic rhetorical forms and modes that are central to composition curricula are ineffective methods for analyzing and addressing the problems that scholars in other disciplines grapple with.

The participants in this study demonstrate through their work that it is possible to move away from the restrictions of putatively race-neutral disciplinary practices by opening spaces in writing classes for students to engage both in institutional analysis, interdisciplinary study, and the design of interdisciplinary methodologies that center race as foundational to rather than peripheral to their conceptual and methodological frameworks. Their work directly challenges the colorblind premises of traditional disciplinary frameworks by forcing students to confront the racialized histories from which these frameworks emerge and by asking them to consider how these practices reinforce institutional racism and racial inequities. The point of encouraging students to engage in interdisciplinary study in writing classes is not to promote disciplinary methods or ideologies as they are traditionally taught and practiced, but rather to give students

372

the space to analyze and interrogate existing practices critically using different lenses that center race, power, oppression, and the experiences of marginalized communities. Students thus engage in critical interdisciplinary and institutional analysis that make visible both the limitations of existing analytical methods as well as the work that needs to be done to address pressing social problems. As a result, they are better equipped to construct the new contexts and methodologies they need both to make sense of and respond to these problems more effectively.

The work that FA, Alex, the Asian American Studies writing instructor, and Dariotis have done to make visible the politics of academic writing is part of a longer history of students and faculty of color fighting to redefine the work of academic writing and education. As we can see by looking at the history of student movements for open admissions and ethnic studies programs, as well as the UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Department's long fight to design and house its own academic writing classes, university writing requirements and the pedagogies used to teach these courses have long been critiqued by students and faculty of color for their racist underpinnings and the ways they have disenfranchised students of color, immigrant students, low-income students, and multilingual students. UC Berkeley's early Asian Studies division and Afro-American Student Union directly challenged these racist ideologies and institutional practices: they named the ways the university writing requirement reproduced racial inequities and offered alternative models of writing instruction that located writing, community languages, as well as the literature and histories of communities of color and third world communities as central to creating material change in society. In these models, writing was inextricably tied to the study of ethnic and third world literature, languages, history, and culture: if students were equipped with the historical knowledge and critical understanding of problems that communities of color faced, they could begin to design solutions to solve these problems and create the material change that these communities needed. Through these interdisciplinary forms of analysis and engagement, writing in UC Berkeley's Asian Studies division became a vehicle

through which students could build the historical and political understandings of local and international problems that they needed to begin developing solutions and interventions. The division's work thus presented academic writing as an explicitly political project in ways that the field of writing studies had never done: it made visible the institutional racism that structured traditional writing programs while also demonstrating how academic writing, when centered around race and when used to interrogate racial, linguistic, and economic power structures, could be a tool with which students could generate new, interdisciplinary methodologies capable of addressing the real problems their communities faced.

These contributions, however, have largely been written out of the official narratives of writing studies in favor of narratives that either present the field itself as responsible for pedagogical and ideological change that students of color demanded, or that overlook the ways students of color reimagined the work of academic writing altogether. Although students in the Third World Liberation Front recognized that their education was failing to serve their communities and demonstrated that higher education and academic writing in particular could play a critical role in contributing to social change and racial justice, the field of writing studies has never formally acknowledged that students of color — not compositionists themselves — forced the field to begin changing its curricula and teaching practices. By extension, the field has also failed acknowledged that it rewrote student demands for social, structural, and ideological transformation in education by framing the putatively neutral skill of error analysis in academic writing as a form of access and empowerment for students of color (Kynard, 2013). As universities and philanthropic organizations like the Ford Foundation strategically financed Black Studies and Ethnic Studies in order to suppress the students' more militant demands for social change and educational revolution, and as academic writing programs began to adopt multicultural curricula to placate students' demands for culturally relevant curricula, the UC Berkeley Asian Studies division's model of using academic writing to challenge linguistic, racial,

374

and economic subordination failed to gain wide acceptance. Its visions and methodologies have thus never been recognized within writing studies as a viable model that the field could use, and without a formal place in the official historical narrative of writing studies, these alternative visions for the work of academic writing have largely been forgotten outside of the ethnic studies programs themselves. Within this context, then, it has been possible for faculty and composition programs to continue to subscribe to curricula and pedagogies that teach students to adopt the race-neutral "technical" skills that will allow them to excel within the existing educational structure, but which do not necessarily change the racial disparities that these skills and systems are designed to reproduce.

As the participants in this study continue their efforts to situate their pedagogical work within larger institutional and political contexts, they have have faced immense challenges in helping others to see the importance of doing the same. Within a labor system and an educational system that are set up both to work in the economic interests of the university and to reward those whose work reproduces the ideologies and outcomes of a product-driven system, faculty whose pedagogical and methodological models fail to align with administrative definitions of "effective" teaching are easily discredited and their innovative work dismissed. The participants in this study may be helping students to build the contexts of understanding and to design the situated methodologies students will need over the long-term in order to challenge disciplinary norms and work towards social change; yet, their efforts are overlooked in writing programs that increasingly favor teaching writing as procedure and that encourage students to report on structure and form as evidence of learning. In the short term, it is easier and more efficient for administrators to assess pedagogies that align with familiar teaching practices or that rely on rote templates than it is to engage in the considerably more complex intellectual and methodological work that instructors like Alex and FA expect of their students.

Yet, the field faces growing pressure to reenvision the work of academic writing within larger institutional, ideological, and racial contexts in the same ways the study participants have done. At the University of California in particular, growing disparities between the different campuses along racial and economic lines underscore the fact that diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives and neoliberalism continue to work in tandem for the benefit of the institution itself rather than for underrepresented students of color. Within the UC system's academic writing programs, these racial disparities can be seen in the wide differences in the percentage of students who are held for the entry-level writing requirement, as well as in students' varying levels of access to the kind of advanced writing and methodology training required for upper-division and graduate study in different disciplines.[1] These structural inequities cannot be solved by launching new diversity initiatives or by focusing on pedagogical change alone. Rather, this requires reimagining educational and institutional structures and ideologies while also working to change the unequal distribution of wealth and resources outside of academia along racial lines. Making these visions a reality requires building different methodologies, new ways of constructing knowledge, and situated forms of analysis that move beyond the bounds of

---

[1] The University of California Infocenter (2020b, 2020c), which examines each campus's Pell Grant distribution by total undergraduate population during the fall semester of each academic year, shows that over time, the number of Pell Grant recipients among UC Berkeley's undergraduates have declined over the years while the number of recipients have increased at UC Merced. These inter-campus differences are further compounded by the fact that UC Merced consistently serves a higher percentage of Pell Grant recipients relative to its undergraduate population compared to UC Berkeley across most racial and ethnic groups, including students who identify as Chinese, Laotian, Hmong, Vietnamese, African American, Black, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Latin American, or Latino (University of California Infocenter, 2020d). Despite these differences between campuses along racial and economic lines, the University of California continues to distribute student tuition unequally across the different UC campuses (Meister, 2009). A significant percentage of enrollment-generated revenue from the smaller UC campuses like UC Merced that serve predominately low-income students of color is redirected to subsidize the operating costs of three of the larger and more established campuses: UC San Francisco (UCSF), UC Los Angeles (UCLA), and UC Davis. For years, the UC system had operated under a system where the flagship campuses would be given larger base budgets in order to fund their larger graduate student populations, but with the requirement that any new state funds and new tuition increases would be returned to each campus on a per student basis. However, the UC did not maintain its promise of redistributing new enrollment-generated revenue equally. Given that tuition revenue had tripled over twenty years and far exceeded the UC system's revenue growth through state funding (Meister, 2009, p. 1), the funding disparities between the campuses have continued to increase disproportionately. For statistics about inter-campus disparities in the percentage of students at UC Berkeley and UC Merced who are held for the entry-level writing course, see the Introduction to this dissertation.

conventional disciplinary practices and multicultural curricula. As FA and Alex have shown through their work, students already bring with them rich experiences and histories as well as unique ways of making sense of information to construct the contexts that allow them to learn, analyze, and construct. If given the spaces and resources to make use of and develop confidence in their ability to design what needs to be built for the problems they face and the futures they hope to bring into being, students can, through ongoing struggle, begin to work together to realize these visions.

It has always been possible for academic writing to contribute to social change instead of ensuring conformity with dominant standards. UC Berkeley's Asian Studies division recognized this in 1969, when the interconnected contexts of declining living conditions in Bay Area Chinatowns, student-led movements to connect higher education to social and racial justice at home and in the Third World, and white supremacist ideologies in the Subject A program converged and made visible the need for educational and social revolution. Politically conscientized by the Third World Strike and thus able to discern how Subject A writing classes reproduced racial hierarchies at the expense of students of color, Elaine Kim and her colleagues rejected writing as remediation and instead transformed it into a tool for addressing urgent problems that communities of color were facing. The contributions that the UC Berkeley Asian American Studies program has made over the years to academic writing have been systematically ignored and written out of the official narratives of composition studies, while the ongoing push for institutional excellence has disenfranchised contingent faculty like FA and Alex whose work challenges the ideological and methodological premises of the field's standard disciplinary practices and learning outcomes. Yet, the immense possibilities and promise contained in their work and their visions for how academic writing can contribute to social transformation offer clear and timely models for the directions writing instructors, students, and administrators can move in for the future. Just as the unique convergence of contexts made it possible for

Berkeley's Ethnic Studies programs to be sites where students of color could begin to see academic writing as a political project tied to their histories, their communities, and pressing problems in the world, the current moment in higher education has highlighted the relevance of and urgent need to take these visions seriously once again as writing instructors and administrators reexamine the impact of their policies and practices on students of color. Students of color and the educators who work with them have demonstrated repeatedly over time that their visions and the methodological, pedagogical, and analytical foundations they need to reconceptualize academic writing have always existed: from the UC Berkeley Afro-American Student Union and the Asian Studies division in the late 1960s to the contemporary Ethnic Studies and Composition departments at San Francisco State University, students and faculty of color are always, as FA maintains, designing and co-constructing their own, novel methodologies and conceptual tools for building the understandings we need to learn, build, and write towards different futures. Although their work has not always been recognized or seen as relevant in the neoliberal university or in the context of disciplinary frameworks, they have put in place the crucial groundwork needed to demonstrate how academic writing classes can place community needs at the center, disinvest in the practices and politics of remediation, and become sites for social and pedagogical change.

References

Ad hoc Committee to Review Subject A and Subject A for Non-Native Speakers of English. (1989). Subject A at the University of California, Berkeley [Faulhaber Report]. University Archives, University of California, Berkeley Commission on Responses to a Changing Student Body 1987 — 1990 (CU-156, Box 3 Folder 20), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Adler-Kassner, L. & Wardle, E. (Eds). (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies.* Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Advisory Committee on Asian American Affairs (1989). Asian Americans at Berkeley: A report to the chancellor. University Archives, University of California, Berkeley Commission on Responses to a Changing Student Body 1987 — 1990 (CU-156, Box 2, Folder 31), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Alford, C.L. (1995). *Bilingual students in composition classes: Dimensions of language use in academic writing* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number 9621034).

Allen, R.L. (1990). *Black awakening in capitalist America.* Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Alnagar, H. & Matos, D. (2020). *Listening tour executive summary: Where we are and where we are going.* University of California Merced Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. https://diversity.ucmerced.edu/sites/diversity.ucmerced.edu/files/page/documents/listening_tour_executive_summary_final_0.pdf.

Alnagar, H., Ramirez Loyola, M., & Danube, C. (2020). *PFW COVID-19 follow-up experience survey update and recommendations.* University of California Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. https://diversity.ucmerced.edu/sites/diversity.ucmerced.edu/files/documents/2020_october_covid-19_experience_survey_presentation_2020.12.16.pdf.

Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and Curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Asian American Studies, University of California, Berkeley. (1975). *Tutor's handbook: Asian American Studies 6A-6B-6C: 1975-1976.* University of California, Berkeley.

Asian Studies Division of Ethnic Studies. (1970a, November 20). Winter Schedule of Courses for 1971. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Asian Studies Division of Ethnic Studies. (1970b, November 20). Spring Schedule of Courses for 1971. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Banks, J.A. (1968). A profile of the Black American: Implications for teaching. *CCC, 19*, 288-296.

Bauer, H. J. (2003). *Gross errors or good English: The historical legacy of the University of California's examination in Subject A* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number 3091210).

Bauman, G.L., Bustillos, L.T., Bensimon, E.M., Brown, M.C., & Bartee, R.D. (2005). *Achieving equitable educational outcomes with all students: The institution's roles and responsibilities.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Bazerman, C. (2015a). Writing expresses and shares meaning to be reconstructed by the reader. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 128-133). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Bazerman, C. (2015b). Writing speaks to situations through recognizable forms. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 99-102). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Bay Area Writing Project. (2020). *Summer Institute.* https://bayareawritingproject.org/isi/.

Barnet, S., Bedau, H. & O'Hara, J. (2017). *From critical thinking to argument* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Before Columbus Foundation. (2020). *Before Columbus Foundation.* http://www.beforecolumbusfoundation.com.

Behrens, L. & Rosen, L. (2017). *A sequence for academic writing, 7th ed.* New York, NY: Pearson.

Bell, D.A. (1980). *Brown v. Board of Education* and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review, 93*(3), 518-534.

Berkeley Academic Guide. (2020). *Asian American and Diaspora Studies R1A, Asian American and Diaspora Studies R2B.* https://classes.berkeley.edu.

Berkeley Recruit. (2019). *Reading and composition lecturer — Department of African American Studies and Ethnic Studies.* https://aprecruit.berkeley.edu/apply.

Berkeley Recruit. (2020). *Reading and composition lecturer — Department of African American Studies and Ethnic Studies.* https://aprecruit.berkeley.edu/apply.

Billingsley, A. (1968, October 14). Statement on the proposal for a department of Afro-American Studies at University of California, Berkeley Draft no. 2 for faculty and staff. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 6), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Billingsley, A. (1969, October 29). Memo to John Raleigh Re: Ethnic Studies courses Fall quarter 1969 course offerings of Ethnic Studies. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 118, Folder 15), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Billingsley, A., Davidson, D., Loya, T. (1970). Third World Studies at Berkeley. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 118, Folder 12), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Biondi, M. (2012). *The black revolution on campus.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Blake, F. & Ioanide, P. (2019). Antiracism incorporated. In F. Blake, P. Ioanide, & A. Reed (Eds.), *Antiracism inc.: Why the way we talk about racial justice matters.* Punctum Books.

Blake Yancey, K. (2005). Standards, outcomes, and all that jazz. In S. Harrington, K. Rhodes, R. Fischer, & R. Malenczyk (Eds.), *The outcomes book: Debate and consensus after the WPA outcomes statement* (pp. 18-23). Utah State University Press: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/usupress_pubs/154.

Blake Yancey, K. (2015a). Coming to terms: Composition/rhetoric, threshold concepts, and a disciplinary core. In Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 25-61). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Blake-Yancey, K. (2015b). Writers' histories, processes, and identities vary. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 163-168). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Bloome, D. & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly 28*(4), 304-333.

Booth, W.C., Columb, G.G., & Williams, J.M. (2008). *The craft of research* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Bousquet, M. (2004). Composition as management science. In M. Bousquet, T. Scott, & L. Parascondola (Eds.), *Tenured bosses and disposable teachers: Writing instruction in the managed university* (pp. 11-35). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bousquet, M. (2008). *How the university works: Higher education and the low-wage nation.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Bousquet, M., Scott, T., & Parascondola, L. (Eds.). (2004). *Tenured bosses and disposable teachers: Writing instruction in the managed university.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bowker, A.H. (1972, May 3). Letter to Delmer Brown. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 121, Folder 3), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Brinner, W.M. (1980, August). Report of the Ethnic Studies review committee. In L. C. Wang, *History of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley: Ethnic Studies 98/198* (pp. 149-176). Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Department of Ethnic Studies.

Brooks, P. (1973, December 6). Outline of Fall 1973 Subject A Course. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 7), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Buras, K.L, Randels, J., & ya Salaam, K. (2010). *Pedagogy, policy, and the privatized city: Stories of dispossession and defiance from New Orleans.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Burawoy, M. & Johnson-Hanks, J. (2018). *Second-class citizens: A survey of Berkeley lecturers.* UC Berkeley Committee on Educational Policy/UC Berkeley Undergraduate Council.

del Carmen Salazar, M. (2018). Interrogating teacher evaluation: Unveiling whiteness as the normative center and moving the margins. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(5), 463-476.

Castanheira, M.L., Crawford, T., Dixon, C.N., & Green, J.L. (2001). Interactional ethnography: An approach to studying the social construction of literate practices. *Linguistics and Education 11*(4), 353-400.

CBS5 KPIX-TV [Video file]. (1968, September 19). *George Mason Murray Press Conference.* Bay Area Television Archive. https://diva.sfsu.edu/collections/sfbatv/bundles/187251.

CCCC Executive Committee. Statement of principles and standards for the postsecondary teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 40*(3), 329-336.

Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning. (2020). *JEDI PIE.* San Francisco State University. https://ceetl.sfsu.edu/jedi-pie-institute-course.

Cervisi v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. 208 Cal. App. 3d 635, 256 Cal. Rptr. 142. Court of Appeals of California, First Appellate District, Division Four. 1989.

Chabram, R. & Jordan, C. (1969, November 12). Letter to John H. Raleigh. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 118, Folder 15), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Chan, S (2005a). Contemporary Asian immigration and its impact on undergraduate education at the University of California, Berkeley [1981]. In *In defense of Asian American Studies: The politics of teaching and program building* (pp. 63-80). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Chan, S. (2005b). The politics of teaching. In *In defense of Asian American Studies: The politics of teaching and program building* (pp. 59-61). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Chan, S. (2005c). They *shall* write! Anthropological observations on teaching verbal skills to Asian-ancestry students [1982]. In *In defense of Asian American Studies: The politics of teaching and program building* (pp. 90-118). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Chan, S. (2005d). An integrated approach to teaching verbal skills to Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students [1981]. In *In defense of Asian American Studies: The politics of teaching and program building* (pp. 81-88). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Cheng, A.A. (2001). *The melancholy of race: Psychoanalysis, assimilation, and hidden grief.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chrétien, (1969, July 14). Memorandum concerning the appointment of Mrs. Sarah W. Fabio as lecturer in Subject A. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 10), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Ciolek, T.M., & Kendon, A. (1980). Environment and the spatial arrangement of conversational encounters. *Sociological Inquiry, 50*(3-4), 237-271.

Clary-Lemon, J. (2009). The racialization of composition studies: Scholarly rhetoric of race since 1990. *College Composition and Communication, 61*(2), W1-W17.

Class Enrollments, Ethnic Studies Fall Quarter 1970. (1970). University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150 Folder 70-71), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

College Composition and Communication Committee on Language Policy. (1974). Students' right to their own language. In S. Perryman-Clark, D.E. Kirkland, & A. Jackson (Eds.). *Students' right to their own language: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 19-57). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Collins, O.R. (1973). Report of the committee appointed to review the Department of Ethnic Studies. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 121, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Committee on Undergraduate Preparatory and Remedial Education [CUPRE]. 1989. CUPRE reply to Faulhaber Report. University Archives, University of California, Berkeley Commission on Responses to a Changing Student Body 1987 — 1990 (CU-156, Box 3, Folder 20), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Council of Writing Program Administrators (2000). WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition. In S. Harrington, K. Rhodes, R. Fischer, & R. Malenczyk (Eds.), *The outcomes book: Debate and consensus after the WPA outcomes statement.* Utah State University Press: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/usupress_pubs/154.

Crenshaw, K., H., L.C., HoSang, D.M., & Lipsitz, G. (Eds.). (2019). *Seeing race again: Countering colorblindness across the disciplines.* Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Crowley, S. (1991). A personal essay on freshman english. *Pre/Text, 12*(3), 156-176.

Davis, B. & Saltmarsh, S. (2007). Gender economies: Literacy and the gendered production of neo-liberal subjectivities. *Gender & Education, 19*(1), 1-20.

Davis, K.S. (1975). Report on Subject A — University of California, Berkeley. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 9), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Dea Collier, I. (2019). The Strike is not over. In R. Jeung, K. Umemoto, H. Dong, E. Mar, L.Hirai Tscuchitani, & A. Pan (Eds.). *Mountain movers: Student activism and the emergence of Asian American Studies* (57-72). Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Asian American Studies Center.

Dekker, C.A. (1971, January 27). Letter to Brendan P. O'Hehir. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 2), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Dekker, C.A. & Romano, O. (1973). Relationships between Ethnic Studies divisions and divisional committees. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 121, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Desjardins, C.D., Dupuis, D., & Johnson, J. (2018). *Sankofa Reading Program year 4 (final) implementation and impact evaluation report*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Education and Human Development, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.

Doe, S., Maisto, M., & Adsit, J. (2017). What works and what counts: Valuing the affective in non-tenure-track advocacy. In S. Kahn, W.B. Lalicker, & A. Lynch-Biniek (Eds.), *Contingency, exploitation, and solidarity: Labor and action in English composition* (pp. 213-234). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Dong, H. (2002). *The origins and trajectory of Asian American political activism in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1968-1978* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3082162).

Donhardt, T. & Layden, S. (2017). Adjuncts foster change: Improving adjunct working conditions by forming an associate faculty coalition (AFC). In In S. Kahn, W.B. Lalicker, & A. Lynch-Biniek (Eds.), *Contingency, exploitation, and solidarity: Labor and action in English composition* (pp. 183-198). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Doyle, L.A. (1970, October 16). Letter to John Coolidge Re: Afro-American Studies A and Contemporary Asian Studies 3. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-71), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Doyle, L.A. (1971a, July 22). Letter to Pat Hayashi Re: Material for meeting of Committee on Courses, August 20, 1971). University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Doyle, L.A. (1971b, August 23). Letter to Ken Kawaichi Re: Contemporary Asian Studies courses, 1971-1972. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Doyle, L.A. (1971c, August 23). Memo to Henrietta Whiteman Re: Courses in Native American Studies, 1971-1972. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 3), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Erickson, F. & Shultz, J. (1981). When is a context? Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J.L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 147-160). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Eschholtz, P., Rosa, A., & Clark, V. (2013). *Language awareness: Readings for college writers* (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Estrem, H. (2015a). Threshold concepts and student learning outcomes. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 237-247). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Estrem, H. (2015b). Writing is a knowledge-making activity. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 94-97). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

E.W.M. (1968, October 22). Subject A. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 117, Folder 56), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Fabio, S.W. (1968). What is Black? *CCC, 19,* 286-287.

Faigley, L.A. (1996). Letter to CCCC Members. Conference on College Composition and Communication.

Fenstermaker, A., Koehler, C., Alonso, M., Miller, S., Silbaugh, D.E., & Gatreau, J. (2019, October). Using students' prior writing experiences to foster diversity, equity, and inclusion. Symposium talk conducted at *Merritt Writing Program Teaching Symposium on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion*, Merced, CA.

Ferreira, J.M. (2003). *All power to the people: A comparative history of third world radicalism in San Francisco, 1968-1974* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number 3121473).

Fries-Britt, S.L., Rowan-Kenyon, H.T., Perna, L.W., Milem, J.F., & Howard, D.G. (2011). Underrepresentation in the academy and the institutional climate for faculty diversity. *The Journal of the Professoriate, 5*(1), 1-34.

Fong, A. (1970, October 5). Letter to Academic Senate Committee on Courses. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folders 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Gallagher, C. (2012). The trouble with outcomes: Pragmatic inquiry and educational aims. *College English, 75*(1), 42-60.

Gilmore, R.W. (2008). Forgotten places and the seeds of grassroots planning. In C.R. Hale (Ed.), *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (pp. 31-61). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goldman, S. & McDermott, R. (2007). Staying the course with video analysis. In R. Goldman, R. Pea, B. Barron, & S.J. Denny (Eds.). *Video research in the learning sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goldstein, L.M. (2005). *Teacher written commentary in second language writing classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Green, J., Skukauskaite, A., & Baker, D. (2012). Ethnography as epistemology: An introduction to educational ethnography. In J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Cos, & L. Hedges (Eds.), *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education* (pp. 309-321). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Greenbaum, L. (1968). Prejudice and purpose in compensatory programs. *CCC, 19,* 305-311.

Greenwood, D.J. (2008). Theoretical research, applied research, and action research: The deinstitutionalization of activist research. In C.R. Hale (Ed.), *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (pp. 319-340). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Grubb, W.N., Boner, E., Frankel, K., Parker, L., Patterson, D., Gabriner, R., Hope, L., Schiorring, E., Smith, B., Taylor, R., Walton, I., Wilson, S. (2011). *Working Paper 2: Basic skills instruction in community colleges: The dominance of remedial pedagogy*. Policy Analysis for California Education. https://www.avc.edu/sites/default/files/administration/ organizations/basicskills/StudentSuccessResArticles/BasicSkillsRemediation.pdf.

Gunner, J. (1993). The status of basic writing teachers: Do we need a 'Maryland Resolution'? *Journal of Basic Writing, 12*(1), 57-63.

Gutierrez, K.D., Larson, J., & Kreuter, B. (1995). Cultural tensions in the scripted classroom: The value of the subjugated perspective. *Urban Education, 29*(4), 410-442.

Gutierrez, R., Nakanishi, D., & Roberts, C. (1992, February). External review of the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. In L. C. Wang, *History of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley: Ethnic Studies 98/198* (216-237). Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Department of Ethnic Studies.

Hacker, D. & Sommers, N. (2017). *A pocket style manual, 8th ed*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Hacker, D. & Sommers, N. (2019). *A writer's reference, 9th ed*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Hacker, D. & Sommers, N. (2020). *Rules for writers, 9th ed.* Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Hale, C.R. (2008). Introduction. In C.R. Hale (Ed.), *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (pp. 1-28). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Harris, J. (2000). Meet the new boss, same as the old boss: Class consciousness in composition. *College Composition & Communication, 52*(1), 43-68).

Hart-Davidson, B. (2015). Genres are enacted by writers and readers. In In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 137-139). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Hayashi, P.S. (1971a, September 23). Letter to Charles Dekker and B.P. O'Hehir. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Hayashi, P.S. (1971b, November 8). Letter to Roger Hahn. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Hoang, H.V. (2015). *Writing against racial injury: The politics of Asian American student rhetoric.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Horton, M. & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Horton, M. & Jacobs, D. (2003). *The Myles Horton reader: Education for social change.* Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Huen, F. (1970). A clarification of the proposal for an educational technique seminar. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., & Clayton-Pedersen, A.R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education, 21*, 279-302.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., & Allen, W.R. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports Series No. 26-8). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action. (1968a, November 25). Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action: Position paper. 1968-1969. University Archives, San Francisco State College Strike Collection (Box 19, Folder 163, Item 1), J. Paul Leonard Library, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA.

Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action. (1968b). Proposal for the establishment of a Chinese ethnic studies department. University Archives, San Francisco State College Strike Collection (Box 19, Folder 163, Item 1), J. Paul Leonard Library, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA.

Inoue, A.B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future.* Anderson, SC: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Inoue, A.B. (2019). *Labor-based grading contracts: Building equity and inclusion in the compassionate writing classroom.* Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Inoue, A.B. (2019, March). How do we language so people stop killing each other, or what do we do about white language supremacy? Keynote Lecture conducted at *Conference on College Composition and Communication, Annual Convention*, Pittsburgh, PA.

Ishizuka, K.L. (2016). *Serve the people: Making Asian American in the long sixties.* Brooklyn, NY: Verso Books.

Johnson, S.T. (1971a, July 12). Letter to John H. Raleigh. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 117, Folder 58), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Johnson, S.T. (1971b, September). Report on Subject A, 1970-1971 University of California, Berkeley. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 117, Folder 58), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Kahn, S. (2017). The problem of speaking for adjuncts. In S. Kahn, W.B. Lalicker, & A. Lynch-Biniek (Eds.), *Contingency, exploitation, and solidarity: Labor and action in English composition* (pp. 259-270). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Kahn, S., Lalicker, W.B., & Lynch-Biniek, A. (2017). *Contingency, exploitation, and solidarity: Labor and action in English composition.* Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Kelley, R.D.G. (2020, June 5). *Race at boiling point: The fire this time.* [Video]. University of California Humanities Research Institute. https://uchri.org/events/race-at-boiling-point-event-series/.

Kelly, E. (1968). Murder of the American dream. *College Composition and Communication, 19*(2), 106-108.

Kendi, I.H. (2012). *The black campus movement: Black students and the racial reconstitution of higher education, 1965-1972.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kezar, A., DePaola, T., & Scott, D.T. (2019). *The gig academy: Mapping labor in the neoliberal university.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kim, E.H. (1978). English and the Asian American college student. *Education and Urban Society, 10*(3), 321-336.

Kirkpatrick, G. & Stack, C.B. (1992, April 10). Review of the Department of Ethnic Studies, University of California, Berkeley. In L. C. Wang, *History of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley: Ethnic Studies 98/198* (180-215). Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Department of Ethnic Studies.

Knight., W.D. (1969, September 22). Letter to Fred E. Crossland. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 1), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Knight, W.D. (1971). Letter to B.P. O'Hehir and S.A. Berger Re: Subject A Program. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 117, Folder 58), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Kynard, C. (2013). *Vernacular insurrections: Race, black protest, and the new century in composition-literacies studies.* Albany, NY: State University of New York.

La Raza Studies. (n.d.). Tentative proposal for La Raza Studies 1969-1970. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 118, Folder 21), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

La Raza Studies. (1970, April 9). Proposed budget for academic year 1970-1971. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 118, Folder 21), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.

Land, R. (2015). Preface. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 13-21). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Lee, J. K-J. (2004). *Urban triage: Race and the fictions of multiculturalism.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Lerner, N. (2015). Writing is a way of enacting disciplinarity. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 139-142). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Lewis, R. (1970, September 21). Memo to Roger Heyns and Robert Connick Re: Basic FTE need for the 1970-1971 academic year. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 12), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Lipman, P. (2011). *The new political economy of urban education: Neoliberalism, race, and the right to the city.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Lu, M-Z. (1991). Redefining the legacy of Mina Shaughnessy: A critique of the politics of linguistic innocence. *Journal of Basic Writing 10*(1), 26-40.

Lu, M-Z. (1999a). Importing "science": Neutralizing basic writing. In B. Horner & M-Z. Liu (Eds.), *Representing the "other": Basic writers and the teaching of basic writing* (pp. 56-104). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Lu, M-Z. (1999b). Redefining the legacy of Mina Shaughnessy: A critique of the politics of linguistic innocence. In B. Horner & M-Z. Lu (Eds.), *Representing the "other": Basic writers and the teaching of basic writing* (pp. 105-116). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Lu, M-Z. (1999c). Conflict and struggle: The enemies or preconditions of basic writing. In B. Horner & M-Z. Lu (Eds.), *Representing the "other": Basic writers and the teaching of basic writing* (pp. 30-55). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Lunsford, A.A. (2015a). Writing addresses, invokes, and/or creates audiences. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 97-99). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Lunsford, A.A. (2015b). Writing is informed by prior experiences. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 168-170). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Maeda, D. J. (2012). *Rethinking the Asian American movement.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Margulies, J. (1971, December 21). Letter to O'Hehir. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 2, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

McIver, M. (2020). *UC-AFT Faculty Bargaining Update and FAQ.* University Council-AFT. https://ucaft.org/content/uc-aft-faculty-bargaining-update-and-faq#What%20are%20our%20goals.

Meister, B. (2009). *Where does UC tuition go?* The Council of UC Faculty Associations. http://cucfa.org/news/2009_nov10.php.

Melamed, J. (2011). *Represent and destroy: Rationalizing violence in the new racial capitalism.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

McDonald, J.C. & Schell, E.E. (2011). The spirit and influence of the Wyoming Resolution: Looking back to look forward. *College English, 73*(4), 360-375.

Milem, J.F., Chang, M.J., & Antonio, A.L. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Milem, J.F., Dey, E.I., & White, C.B. (2004). Diversity considerations in health professions education. In B.D. Smedley, A.S. Butler, & L.R. Bristow (Eds.), *In the nation's compelling interest: Ensuring diversity in the health-care workforce* (pp. 345-389). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Mitchell, N.O. (2011). *Disciplinary matters: Black Studies and the politics of institutionalization* (Publication No. 3480354) [Doctoral dissertation, University of California Santa Cruz]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Moses, R.P., Kamii, M., & Swap, S.M. (1989). The algebra project: Organizing in the spirit of Ella. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*, 423-443.

Müeller, G.G. de, & Ruiz, I. (2017). Race, silence, and writing program administration: A qualitative study of U.S. college writing programs. *WPA: Writing Program Administration: Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators 40*(2), 19-39.

Murase, M. (1974). Towards barefoot journalism. *Gidra, 9*, 1, 34-46.

Murphy, M. (2000). New faculty for a new university: Toward a full-time teaching-intensive faculty track in composition. *College Composition and Communication, 52,* 14-42.

Musgrave, M. (1971). Failing minority students: Class, caste, and racial bias in American colleges. *College Composition and Communication, 22*(1), 24-29.

NCTE. (1974). Resolution #74.2.

New, M.J. (2018). Panther teacher: Sarah Webster Fabio's black power. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism, 17*(1), 51-81.

Ninth Essay Topic Subject A. (1971, February 16). University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 2, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Office of the Academic Senate. (1970, October 8). List of Ethnic Studies courses approved by the Committee on Courses for fall, 1970 only. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-71), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

O'Hehir, B.P. (1971, February 5). Letter to Charles A. Dekker. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 2), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Palumbo-Liu, D. (1995). Introduction. In D. Palumbo-Liu (Ed.). *The ethnic canon: Histories, institutions, and interventions* (pp. 1-27). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Patton, L.D., Sánchez, B., Mac, J., & Stewart, D-L (2019). An inconvenient truth about 'progress': An analysis of the promises and perils of research on campus diversity initiatives. *The Review of Higher Education, 42*, 173-198.

Porter, J. & Sullivan, P.A., Blythe, S., Grabill, J.T., & Miles, E.A. (2000). Institutional Critique: A rhetorical methodology for change. *College Composition and Communication, 51*, 610-641.

Pounder, J.S. (2007). Is student evaluation of teaching worthwhile?: An analytical framework for answering the question. *Quality Assurance in Education, 15*(2), 178-191.

Prendergast, C. (1998). Race: The absent presence in composition studies. *College Composition and Communication 50*(1), 36-53.

Prendergast, C. (2003). *Literacy and racial justice: The politics of learning after* Brown v. Board of Education. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Randels, J. (2010). It's the working conditions, not the teachers. In K.L. Buras, J. Randels, K. ya Salaam, & Students at the Center. *Pedagogy, policy, and the privatized city: Stories of dispossession and defiance from New Orleans.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Resources in Native American Indian Studies at Berkeley, Appendix B2. (1970). University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 118, Folder 19), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Robertson, L.R., Crowley, S., & Lentricchia, F. (1987). The Wyoming conference resolution opposing unfair salaries and working conditions for post-secondary teachers of writing. *National Council of Teachers of English, 49*(3), 274-280.

Rooks, N.M. (2006). *White money/Black power: The surprising history of African American Studies and the crisis of race in higher education.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Roozen, K. (2015) Writing is a social and rhetorical activity. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 90-94). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Royster, J.J. & Williams, J.C. (1999). History in the spaces left: African American presence and narratives of compositional studies. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(4), 563-584.

Ruggles Gere, A. (1994). Kitchen tables and rented rooms: The extracurriculum of composition. *College Composition and Communication 45*(1), 75-92.

Ruiz, I.D. (2016). *Reclaiming composition for Chicano/as and other ethnic minorities: A critical history and pedagogy.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ruiz, I.D. (2019, October). Decolonizing pedagogical praxis within composition and literacy studies. Symposium keynote lecture and workshop conducted at *Merritt Writing Program Teaching Symposium on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion*, Merced, CA.

Samuels, R. (2013). *Reinventing access: Free public higher education, quality instruction, and job security for all faculty members.* Profession MLA. https://profession.mla.org/reinventing-access-free-public-higher-education-quality-instruction-and-job-security-for-all-faculty-members/.

Schell, E.E. (1998). *Gypsy academics and mother-teachers.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Schell, E.E. (2004). Toward a new labor movement in higher education: Contingent labor and organizing for change. In M. Bousquet, T. Scott, & L. Parascondola (Eds.), *Tenured bosses and disposable teachers: Writing instruction in the managed university* (pp. 100-110). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

SFSC Black Students Union. (1968). Black Studies Curriculum. S.F. State College Strike Collection, S.F. State College Archives, San Francisco, CA. https://diva.sfsu.edu/collections/strike/bundles/187916.

Shaughnessy, M. P. (1977). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teachers of basic writing.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Siddle Walker, E.V. (1992). Falling asleep and failure among African-American students: Rethinking assumptions about process teaching. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(4), 321-327.

Siddle Walker, V. (2009). Second-class integration: A historical perspective for a contemporary agenda. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(2), 269-284.

Siddle Walker, V. (2013). Tolerated tokenism, or the injustice in justice: Black teacher associations and their forgotten struggle for educational justice, 1921-1954. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 46*(1), 64-84.

Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L.L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sledd, J. (1991). Why the Wyoming Resolution had to be emasculated: A history and a quixotism. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 269-281.

Smith, F.T. (1972). Proposal: Development of an academic masterplan in Afro-American studies UC Berkeley. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 121, Folder 4), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Smitherman, G. (1972). English teacher, why do you be doing the thangs you don't do? *English Journal, 61*(1), 69.

Smitherman, G. (1974). "Soul n' style." *The English Journal, 63*(2-6).

Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Smitherman, G. (1999). CCCC's role in the struggle for language rights. In S. Perryman-Clark, D.E. Kirkland, & A. Jackson (Eds.). *Students' right to their own language: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 58-82). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Stanley, J. (2010). *The rhetoric of remediation: Negotiating entitlement and access to higher education.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Stark, P.B. & Freishtat, R. (2014). An evaluation of course evaluations. *ScienceOpen*, 1-26. DOI: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AOFRQA.v1.

Strickland, D. (2004). The managerial unconscious of composition studies. In M. Bousquet, T. Scott, & L. Parascondola (Eds.), *Tenured bosses and disposable teachers: Writing instruction in the managed university* (pp. 46-56). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Swales, J. M. & Feak, C.B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Takagi, P. (1971, May 24). Letter to Walter Knight. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 117, Folder 58), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Taylor, U. (2010). Origins of African American Studies at UC-Berkeley. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 34*(2), 256-265.

Thomas, R. (1970-1971). Afro-American Studies 1A, 1B Reading Schedules. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 71-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Turner, R. & Martin, J. (1972, April 11). Subject A Report. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley AASU Black Freshmen. (1968, October 7). Statement by the black freshmen — AASU. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 6), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Academic Personnel Office. (2018). Document Checksheet C-4: Excellence Review. https://apo.berkeley.edu/unit-18-lecturer-and-senior-lecturer.

UC Berkeley Afro-American Studies. (1970a, September 14). Courses proposed in the Afro-American studies major (fall quarter listing only). University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 12), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Afro-American Studies. (1970b, September 24). Fall quarter, 1970, class descriptions. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 12), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Asian Studies. (1971). List of faculty members and personal information. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Asian Studies 3A, B, C (1971): A proposal for a three-quarter sequence in reading and composition. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division. (1971, September 12). A college-level reading and composition program for students of Asian descent: Diagnosis and design. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Asian Studies Division. (1972, March 23). Contemporary Asian Studies Division Report. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 121, Folder 3), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Black Faculty. (1970, September 29). Memo from Black Faculty to Ron Lewis Re: FTE. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 12), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Chicano Studies. (1972a, January 14). Agenda: Curriculum committee. Chicano Studies Program Records, Chicano Studies Collection (CS ARC 2009/1, Box 3, Folder 26), Ethnic Studies Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Chicano Studies. (1972b, June 20). Proposal for an extended reading and composition sequence: Chicano Studies 2A-2B-2C. Chicano Studies Program Records, Chicano Studies Collection (CS ARC 2009/1, Box 3, Folder 26), Ethnic Studies Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Department of Ethnic Studies Reading and Composition Committee. (1972, March 2). Letter to R. Hahn Re: Report of the sub-committee on Subject A. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Division of Equity and Inclusion (2009). *UC Berkeley strategic plan for equity, inclusion, and diversity: Pathway to excellence: Executive summary.* https://diversity.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/executivesummary_webversion.pdf.

UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies/Contemporary Asian Studies. (1971, August 20). Request for approval or withdrawal of a course. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folder 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Faculty. (n.d.). University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 121, Folder 1), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Fall and Winter Quarter Enrollments. (1969). University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 118, Folder 15), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Ethnic Studies Program Survey. (n.d.). Third World Strike at UC Berkeley Collection (CES ARC 2015/1, Box 2, Folder 16), Ethnic Studies Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Native American Studies. (1973, December 14). Native American Studies 1974-1975 target budget. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 121, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Berkeley Subject A Sub-Committee. (1972, January 1). Report of Subject A Sub-committee. University Archives, University of California, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 102, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

UC Davis University Writing Program. (2019). *Student learning objectives*. University Writing Program. https://writing.ucdavis.edu/academics/student-learning-objectives.

UC Merced Academic Personnel Office. (2020a). *Digital Measures FAQs*. UC Merced Academic Personnel Office. http://academicpersonnel.ucmerced.edu/faqs/digital-measures.

UC Merced Academic Personnel Office. (2020b). *Digital Measures — Data entry manual*. UC Merced Academic Personnel Office. http://academicpersonnel.ucmerced.edu/sites/academicpersonnel.ucmerced.edu/files/page/documents/dm_-_data_entry_manual_edited.pdf.

UC Merced Class Schedule. (2020). *UC Merced class schedule for fall semester 2020*. University of California Merced. https://mystudentrecord.ucmerced.edu/pls/PROD/xhwschedule.p_selectsubject.

UC Merced Fast Facts (2020). *Fast facts 2019-2020: Undergraduate students by ethnicity*. University of California Merced. Retrieved December 29, 2020 from https://www.ucmerced.edu/fast-facts.

UC Merced Karen Merritt Writing Program. (2019). *Program learning outcomes*. UC Merced Karen Merritt Writing Program. https://writingprogram.ucmerced.edu/plo .

UC Merced Merritt Writing Program. (2018). Merritt Writing Program Diversity Initiatives Committee Grant Proposal 2018-2019. https://diversity.ucmerced.edu/sites/diversity.ucmerced.edu/files/page/documents/merritt_writing_program_diversity_initiatives_application_2018_19.pdf

UC Merced Merritt Writing Program. (2019). Merritt Writing Program Diversity Initiatives: Curriculum and Pedagogy 2019-2020. https://diversity.ucmerced.edu/sites/diversity.ucmerced.edu/files/page/documents/merritt_writing_program_diversity_initiatives_1.pdf

UC Merced Merritt Writing Program Academic Review Committee. (2019). *Merritt Writing Program procedures for evaluating and reappointing Unit 18 lecturers.*

UC San Diego Dimensions of Culture Program. (2019). *Learning outcomes.* https://marshall.ucsd.edu/doc/#Learning-Outcomes.

UC Santa Cruz Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (2011). *2009-2011 Report.* http://diversity.ucsc.edu/about/images/2009-11_report.pdf.

UC Santa Cruz Writing Program. (2019). *C1 & C2 outcomes.* https://writing.ucsc.edu/requirements/c1c2objectives.html .

Umemoto, K. (1989). "On strike!" San Francisco State College strike, 1968-69: The role of Asian American students. *Amerasia, 15*(1), 3-41.

Unit 18 Non-Senate Faculty Memorandum of Understanding. (2020a). *Article 7a: Pre-six appointment and reappointment.* University Council-AFT. https://ucaft.org/content/unit-18-mou.

Unit 18 Non-Senate Faculty Memorandum of Understanding. (2020b). *Article 7b: Process for achieving continuing status and continuing appointments.* University Council-AFT. https://ucaft.org/content/unit-18-mou.

Unit 18 Non-Senate Faculty Memorandum of Understanding. (2020c). *Article 22: Merit Review Process.* University Council-AFT. https://ucaft.org/content/unit-18-mou.

University Council-AFT. (2021). *Lecturer accomplishments 2000-2017.* University Council-AFT. https://ucaft.org/sites/default/files/main/Accomplishments_2000-17.pdf.

University of California Assembly of the Academic Senate. (2020). Regents policy 4400: Policy on University of California diversity statement. University of California Board of Regents. https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/4400.html.

University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement. (2020a). Design. https://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/elwr/about-the-exam/design.html.

University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement. (2020b). Scoring. https://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/elwr/about-the-exam/scoring.html.

University of California Infocenter. (2020a). *Fall enrollment at a glance: UC Merced 2020 Undergraduate New Enrollment Status.* https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocentere/fall-enrollment-glance.

University of California Infocenter. (2020b). *Fall enrollment at a glance.* https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/fall-enrollment-glance.

University of California Infocenter. (2020c). *UC and comparator Pell recipient graduation rates.* https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/pell-enrollment-graduation.

University of California Infocenter. (2020d). *Fall duplicated enrollments by disaggregated race/ethnicity*. https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/disaggregated-data.

University of California, Merced. (2020). Principles of Community. https://www.ucmerced.edu/principles-of-community.

University of California Office of the President. (2020a). *University of California Academic Personnel Manual*. https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/index.html

University of California Office of the President. (2020b). APM 210-1-d: Appointment and Promotion: Review and Appraisal Committees. In *University of California Academic Personnel Manual*. https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-210.pdf.

University of California Office of the President. (2020c). APM 283-10: Appointment and Promotion: Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. In *University of California Academic Personnel Manual*. https://ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-283.pdf.

Vargas, J.H.C. (2006). *Catching hell in the city of angels: Life and meanings of blackness in South Central Los Angeles*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Vega, L. (2014). The history of UC tuition since 1868. *The Daily Clog: A Cal Blog by The Daily Californian*. Retrieved from https://www.dailycal.org/2014/12/22/history-uc-tuition-since-1868/.

Villanueva, V. (1999). On the rhetoric and precedents of racism. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(4), 645-661.

Wang, L.L-c. (1992, June 24). Letter to Ian Carmichael Re: Departmental response to the Kirkpatrick/Stack report. In L. C. Wang, *History of Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley: Ethnic Studies 98/198* (pp. 243-249). Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Department of Ethnic Studies.

Wang, L.L-c. (2019). UC Berkeley's Asian American Studies: 50 years of growing pains and gains. In R. Jeung, K. Umemoto, H. Dong, E. Mar, L.H. Tsuchitani & A. Pan (Eds.), *Mountain movers: Student activism & the emergence of Asian American Studies* (pp. 91-111). Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Asian American Studies Center Press.

Watanabe, C. (1971). A college-level reading and composition program for students of Asian descent: Diagnosis and design. University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 5), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Waterhouse, J. (1972, July). Chicano Studies 1A-1B: English reading and composition for native speakers of Spanish. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folders 70-71), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Watermark. (2018). Digital measures joins Watermark to advance educational intelligence solutions for higher education. https://www.watermarkinsights.com/press/digital-measures-joins-watermark-to-advance-educational-intelligence-solutions-for-higher-education/.

Watermark. (2020a). *Faculty activity reporting.* Watermark. https://www.watermarkinsights.com/our-approach/faculty-activity-reporting/.

Watermark. (2020b). *The essential guide to faculty qualifications.* https://go.watermarkinsights.com/rs/178-ONE-865/images/faculty_qualifications_ebook.pdf.

Webster Fabio, S. (1968a). *A black paper by a black writer on white papers by white writers on blacks and black writing: Specifically, White on Black and Black on White.* University Archives, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley 1952 — [ongoing] (CU-149, Box 119, Folder 7), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Webster Fabio, S. (1968b). *Saga of the black man.* Oakland, CA: Turn Over Book Store.

Williams, D.A., Berger, J.B., & McClendon, S.A. (2005). *Toward a model of inclusive excellence and change in postsecondary institutions.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Wilson, J.L. (2013). Emerging trend: The chief diversity officer phenomenon within higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education, 82*(4), 433-445.

Wixman, M.H. (1970, January 23). Letter to Charles W. Jones Re: The equivalence evaluation between Asian Studies 3 and Subject A. University Archives, University of California Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Records, 1869 — (CU-9, Box 150, Folders 70-72), The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.

Wooton, L. & Moomau, G. (2017). Building our own bridges: A case study in contingent faculty self-advocacy. In S. Kahn, Lalicker, W.B., & A. Lynch-Biniek (Eds)., *Contingency, exploitation, and solidarity: Labor and action in English composition* (pp. 199-212). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Wright, A.L. (2017). The rhetoric of excellence and the erasure of graduate labor. In S. Kahn, Lalicker, W.B., & A. Lynch-Biniek (Eds)., *Contingency, exploitation, and solidarity: Labor and action in English composition* (pp. 271-278). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

ya Salaam, K. (2010). We stand by our students. In K.L. Buras, J. Randels, & K. ya Salaam. *Pedagogy, policy, and the privatized city: Stories of dispossession and defiance from New Orleans.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.