Supplemental Material

"Reflection as Relationality: Rhetorical Alliances and Teaching Alternative Rhetorics"

V. Jo Hsu

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

I started graduate school studying creative writing, and like many MFA students, I taught first-year composition. Most of the textbooks we used for FYC situated the "personal essay" as the first assignment, describing it as an "accessible" genre that students would find less challenging than the traditional research paper. I contrasted this understanding of the personal essay with the difficult, vulnerable work of creative nonfiction workshops – how terrifying it was to surrender our truths to peer criticism; how impossible it felt to even carve that truth into a shape that others would recognize. My research began with this incongruence. I wanted to know: What did first-year students lose when we delivered them a reductive version of an otherwise sophisticated and powerful genre? How can we better teach them to access the potential of personal essays for cultural analysis and critique?

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

I was fortunate in that this essay emerged organically from my work as a teacher. I did not originally envision a publication. I wanted to design a course that could explore how creative nonfiction can illuminate the interdependence of the "personal" and the "public." We would consider how individual experiences are conditioned by surrounding social and institutional formations and how an individual's life chances are affected by the ways they align – or fail to align – with different categories of social belonging (e.g. gender, race, sexual orientation, disability, class, etc.). To design the class, I combined what I had learned from creative writing craft classes with my background as a rhetorician, creating lesson plans that explored the rhetorical impact of "creative" devices—for example, balancing action vs. reflection; figurative language; scene vs. summary; and character and plot development.

Perhaps even more critical to the execution of the class, however, are the actual relationships we form within the classroom. Meaningful discoveries are high stakes; they require us to risk the stability of our worldview and to be willing to discuss them with our peers and teachers. More, they require us to respect our peers and teachers enough to allow them into those worldviews—

to augment or expand what we think we know. I've taught this class three times now, and it feels like a new (exhilarating, gratifying, difficult) experience every time. Because the students' own workshop contributions compose a significant part of the curriculum, the class is driven by the students. It moves in the directions that they take it. I adapt throughout the semester so we spend more time on topics that they find interesting; we detour into creative strategies and methods that they tend to use, and we modify our reading schedule to find writers who touch on resonant ideas or narrative forms.

For any of these explorations to work, teachers have to establish and model discursive practices conducive toward vulnerability and mutual care. I see this as one of the greatest responsibilities and gifts of my job—that I get to earn students' trust every semester, or at least try. No matter what class I'm teaching, I start with that foundation. While other courses might not be as personalized (in that students are not writing directly from the personal), I do keep an eye toward relationality—how do I highlight the ways we are *already* in relation with the material and one another? How do I nurture these relationships so that students are interested and invested in not only the content but in one another's engagement with the class? Like most teachers, I imagine, I have varying success with each class, but I too am learning with every step and misstep, and I hope to have the privilege of doing so for many years to come.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. In their exploration of rhetorical alliance, Del Hierro et al. write, "The critical question is not 'How do I avoid ever making a mistake?' but rather 'What do I need to do after I make a mistake?'" Consider examples of public rhetoric following a "mistake"—be that a public figure's individual apology or a nation's reckoning with its own violent histories. In what ways are these responses conducive toward alliance? In what ways do they foreclose or inhibit relationality?

2. This essay focuses on an abstraction that writing teachers often discuss as if its meaning is self-evident: "reflection." What are other terms in writing instruction that could use clarification, complication, and/or deeper exploration? What does it mean to you? What do you find confusing or challenging about it?

3. We often notice the oversights of social and structural norms when our experiences come up against their limitations—for example, if you use a wheelchair, you are probably more attuned to how many entryways, walkways, and other spaces presume that everyone has

walking privilege. Recall a moment when your own experience exposed the exclusions of a shared norm. What histories have helped entrench this assumption, policy, or practice? What institutions and/or which people have the power to change these structures? What arguments would be persuasive to these different constituencies? What genres might suit those arguments? What are their strengths and weaknesses?

Supplemental Material

"Decolonizing Community Writing with Community Listening: Story, Transrhetorical Resistance, and Indigenous Cultural Literacy Activism"

Rachel C. Jackson with Dorothy Whitehorse DeLaune

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

The origin of this article begins with our longstanding and ongoing relationship, based in our collaboration as co-facilitators of the Kiowa Clemente Course in the Humanities, the Indigenous humanities course detailed in the essay. As friends, we share many personality traits as well as life commitments. We are both open, easy, and curious with people, and we understand ourselves as connected to long histories and vital communities of our respective peoples. In our time alone together, over the phone or during long car rides through the Oklahoma countryside, we talk like sisters with each other, sharing stories and struggles, and laughing like no one in the world can hear us. This article originates, as it begins here, with our conversations on our journey together building a community-based cultural literacy project and adapting it to the assets, interests, and needs of the Kiowa community. According to the course design, Kiowa cultural knowledge centers the course in terms of pedagogy and content. Dorothy holds an honored role as an elder, a knowledge keeper, a storyteller, a first-language Kiowa speaker, and a grandmother to many members of the community. She teaches as she speaks, her words spirited with Kiowa culture and life, her observations and ideas animated by Kiowa values and sensitivities, and her speech marked by cultural practices and proclivities appearing in subtle patterns and rhythms as she talks. One of these patterns is this: if you ask her a question, she tells a story. Over our nearly ten years of collaboration and conversation, the same stories continue to bear repeating, each time in a new context and (thus) in a new way. The stories accumulate meaning with each telling, remaining alive and without end, deepening connections for listeners as well as inscribing themselves in the community's cultural memories. As an Indigenous cultural and rhetorical practice, storytelling works in a wholly different way than Western academic discourse. The challenge of sustaining Indigenous cultural knowledge within an academic context (whether from within the university itself or through an academic article) requires presenting that knowledge in and against the language and discursive practices of an historically oppressive settler-colonial institution. Our working relationship teaches us both new ways

of meeting or, rather, managing this challenge while privileging Indigenous practices such as reciprocity and collectivity. "Decolonizing Community Writing with Community Listening" emerges as much from this challenge as it does from our conversations, because in many ways this challenge occurs, like the article itself, at the center of our relationship.

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

The research process Rachel undertook as a doctoral candidate required institutional review board approval and formal research protocols. Field interviews, as a qualitative research method (used in ethnographic methodologies) and informed consent, proved a flexible form for engaging cultural literacy workers in an open discussion about activism and resistance. All field interviews were transcribed and coded for emergent rhetorical patterns, practices, and themes. Rachel first formally interviewed Dorothy for this dissertation research. That interview, conducted on May 14th, 2014, is incorporated and cited in the article along with subsequent interviews we conducted after committing to writing this piece together. In many ways, the connections we draw in the article between Dorothy's own cultural commitments and those of her father, emerge newly for both of us as a result of sitting with these stories to discern what meaning they lend to our understanding of community literacy activism, resistance and transrhetoricity, and the role stories play in sustaining Indigenous knowledges. The article, we hope, demonstrates the type of transrhetorical listening for which it argues, as we attempt to make apparent in the text our process of making meaning together while occupying and bridging different cultural/institutional spaces. We have found transrhetorical listening an effective tool for sustaining a community-based Indigenous cultural literacy project such as the Kiowa Clemente Course. As the article establishes, our storywork informs our teaching, enabling us to strengthen connections between course objectives and stories told and to invent new ways of engaging students/listeners in the process of meaning making during and between classes. This includes taking the time to ask what connections arise for students/listeners between the stories Dorothy tells and the stories they have been told by other elders and integrating the broader matrix of meanings that emerge into class discussion as well as course planning. Engaging such a matrix highlights to us as well as course participants the collective agency necessary for sustaining Indigenous cultural knowledges in colonial contexts, while also building a broader community archive of Kiowa stories.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. In order to facilitate audience engagement with the article that replicates listener engagement with Kiowa stories, the authors attempt to resist drawing concrete conclusions and fixed interpretations as story episodes appear in the article and instead draw connections. In your experience as a reader, to what extent does their resistance of this Western writing convention succeed and how? Was it frustrating or liberating to encounter Dorothy's stories in this way?

2. How does the author's relationship, detailed early in the article, shape the construction of community literacy and community listening for which the stories advocate? In what ways does it complicate and/or illuminate the role of the community-engaged scholar?

3. The article makes a subtle claim that in sharing Kiowa stories with readers it also conscripts them in the process of sustaining Indigenous cultural knowledge, a position that comes with the responsibility to collaborate as a meaning maker. How does your encounter with these stories shape your understanding of Indigenous cultural literacy activism as well as your role in it?

Supplemental Material

"Decolonial Potential in a Multilingual FYC"

Cruz Medina

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

The idea for this piece began in 2013 when I learned that my colleague at Santa Clara University, Juan Velasco, was teaching a bilingual first-year writing class. I was interested in the course because of my experience teaching at the University of Arizona in Tucson where I saw first-hand the impact of culturally relevant courses in the Tucson Unified School District. Despite the increases in state test scores and graduation rates (Cabrera et al.), the Ethnic Studies program in Tucson came under attack from the State Superintendents of Education, Tom Horne and John Huppenthal. Beliefs that the program was attacked because the success of Latinx students in Arizona unsettled beliefs about white supremacy seemed somewhat validated when it was discovered that anonymous comments posted online about wiping out Jews and Africans were written by Huppenthal (Roberts 2014). While the concern about the outreach of white supremacy prior to the 2016 election was out of the mainstream, white supremacists have since then marched with tiki torches, attacked and killed counter protesters in Charlottesville, and lynched joggers in Georgia (for a detailed explanation of lynching, see Ersula Ore's book *Lynching*).

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

This article underwent several iterations through the process of submission. It was flat out desk-rejected by the editor of one National Council of Teachers of English journal. The editor believed the journal had enough submissions or forthcoming articles on the topic of translingualism (I had seen only one such article). When the incoming editor of a different NCTE journal announced that the journal would be accepting articles for a new section on pedagogy emphasizing empirical methods, I emailed the editor with a query, despite my discomfort at having to argue for decolonial methods as empirically valid. Still, I explained the topic, hoping perhaps for some indication whether to submit. A short response from the editor said they could not be sure without seeing the entire manuscript. Ignoring this noncommittal response, I revised the manuscript following knowledge conven-

tions of empirical scholarship, doing my best to transform the voices of the student writers into what could be more objectively called a data set. This "empirical" version received a revise and resubmit, which I completed based on the reviewer's feedback. When the revised article was rejected, I submitted this "empirical" version to *Composition Studies* somewhat self-deceived that this "objective"-sounding version benefitted from the most revision.

I am extremely appreciative of Laura Micciche's editorial guidance with this piece, helping me to re-center student voices and validate the decolonial perspective that had been undermined in the pursuit of so-called empiricism. Laura gave me an encouraging revise and resubmit that recommended restructuring the article back to an organization that resembled the structure of the pre-"empirical" version. When my revisions still clung to the pseudo-social science format, Laura connected me with Bob Mayberry, a former *Composition Studies* editor, who offered generous and supportive feedback that helped me restore my faith in my writing. Unfortunately, my experience had been with editors who undermine the research of scholars of color through their adherence to exclusionary editorial philosophies or worse. Since the publication of "Decolonial Potential in a Multilingual FYC," I have conducted surveys and interviews with primarily Latinx scholars of color on their experiences with publishing. Exclusionary editorial practices are among the experiences of the scholars whose voices fill the pages in the manuscript that will appear in the forthcoming *Rhetoric Review* article (Medina and Luna 2020).

Pedagogically, when I teach genres of writing that include personal writing such as literacy narratives, autoethnography, or digital testimonio (Medina 2018), I let students know that including languages other than English is encouraged and worth consideration. These inclusions of languages other than English can be important when students feel like what someone told them can't necessarily be translated exactly to English or what the person said in another language was impactful, especially when encouraging or discouraging education. The work of decolonial scholarship arguing for writing in languages other than English parallels, and in many ways follows, scholarship advocating for Students' Rights to Their Own Language since 1974. Unfortunately, the statement by Geneva Smitherman and Victor Villanueva remains something of a dream deferred when it comes to the kinds of outcomes that are standardized in institutional rubrics; in many ways, the lack of action following policy statements underscore indigenous scholars and writers' skepticism of policies that follow traditions of broken treatise by the U.S. and other settler forces (Deloria, Jr. 1969). This is not meant to be an "I told you so" to any one journal but more context providing exigency for decolonial work that problematizes an overreliance on "empirical" meth-

ods that have been used, and continue to be used, to silence and marginalize and how scholars of color and writers researching multilingualism struggle for inclusion.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. Other than multilingual writing, what kinds of decolonial practices can be incorporated into the classroom and supported at the institutional level?
2. In what ways can we encourage students to write in languages other than Standard Academic English?
3. What ways can we create goals, rubrics, and outcomes that honor multilingualism and values it beyond style or voice?

Works Cited

Cabrera, Nolan L., Jeffrey F. Milem, Ozan Jaquette, and Ronald W. Marx. "Missing the (Student Achievement) Forest for All the (Political) Trees: Empiricism and the Mexican American Studies Controversy in Tucson." *American Educational Research Journal*, vol.51, no. 6, 2014, pp.1084-118.

Deloria Jr., Vine. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. University of Oklahoma P, 1969.

Medina, Cruz. "Digital Testimonio: Latin@ Multimodal Storytelling." *Racial Shorthand: Coded Discrimination in Social Media*, edited by Cruz Medina and Octavio Pimentel. Computers and Composition Digital P/Utah State UP, 2018, http://ccdigitalpress.org/shorthand.

Medina, Cruz and Perla Luna. "'Publishing Is Mystical': The Latinx Caucus Bibliography, Top-Tier Journals, and Minority Scholarship." *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 39, no.3, 2020, pp. 303–16, DOI: 10.1080/07350198.2020.1764764.

Ore, Ersula J. *Lynching: Violence, Rhetoric, and American Identity.* UP of Mississippi, 2019.

Roberts, Laurie. "Roberts: John Huppenthal unmasked" AZCentral.com. USA Today network. June 19, 2014 | Updated 10:27 a.m. MT June 24, 2014, https://www.azcentral.com/story/laurie-roberts/2014/06/19/john-huppenthal/10901575/

Supplemental Material

"Powerful Marginality: Feminist Scholarship through Comics"

Rachel Rys

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

The earliest traces of this piece emerged in response to a frustrating classroom discussion and impromptu exercise. While teaching a senior capstone course on feminist theory, I found that my brilliant students often struggled to grasp and apply the nuances of some of our most theoretical readings. For example, many students narrowly interpreted the theory of *intersectionality*[1]—an expansive framework developed by Kimberlé Crenshaw which argues that oppressive structures are inextricably linked—as an argument about personal identities, rather than societal structures. Attempting to pivot from an unproductive discussion, I asked my students to spend a few minutes sketching out their understanding of the term "intersectionality." The drawings they created—which ranged from labeled Venn diagrams to chaotic traffic intersections to self-portraits pierced with labelled arrows—provided a concrete starting point for discussing the strengths and limits of each interpretation relative to the original text. Beyond making visible my students' specific struggles with this theory, this drawing exercise made me realize just how prevalent visual metaphors are in our academic social theories—and how profoundly these visual interpretations can facilitate or constrain our ability to apply abstract ideas. Building on my students' sketches, I began to develop a series of teaching resources that used visual representations to help students assess, clarify, and deepen their understanding of theory. These resources underscored the potential that visual and multimodal forms held for teaching academic theory in new and nuanced ways.

These realizations about the pedagogical potential of multimodality collided with my growing theoretical interest in the discussions and (non) traditions of alternative and emergent writing practices within the field of feminist studies.[2] Inspired by this history, I sought to develop a project that used visual and multimodal tools to interrogate and unsettle accepted conventions of academic writing in both focus and form. These dual commitments to pedagogy and form ultimately led me to the comics medium: As I drew, arranged, and annotated my visual teaching resources, I began to

1. For early discussions of intersectionality, see Crenshaw (1989, 1991).

2. For an introduction to alternative (or "emergent") feminist writing practices, see Livholts (2012).

recognize the early traces of a comic. More importantly, I began to recognize how the relationship between text and image, and between one panel and the next, facilitated a dynamic and layered narrative.

Although my early path to *comics-based research*[3] was primarily motivated by pedagogical and pragmatic interests, I quickly realized that the comics form was also *theoretically* aligned with feminist approaches to knowledge. My research focus thus turned to the comics medium itself, exploring the histories, conventions, and formal properties that make the comics medium not only a possible alternative form for feminist scholarship, but an alternative form that is particularly well-suited for this work. I chose to present my arguments through a *metacomic*—a self-referential comic that uses the comics form to talk about the comics form—in order to both discuss and demonstrate these storytelling tools in practice.

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

This piece was my very first experience writing in the comics form. Before I started this project, I first spent countless hours observing and analyzing how other comics creators had used the comics form to tell stories that engaged either explicitly or thematically with theories of marginalization, power, and social justice. I began by analyzing intentionally instructional comics, such as the short webcomics on the website *Everyday Feminism,* which use comics to explain concepts such as white privilege and asexuality. These comics use clear and repeated patterns to instruct and persuade, including an embodied narrator who speaks directly to the reader and who scaffolds their lessons by combining familiar physical teaching tools (like books and blackboards) with narrative teaching tools (like flashbacks and imagined or abstract sequences). Additionally, I also read and analyzed many feminist autobiographical and narrative comics, from *The Complete Wimmen's Comix*, a collection of women-authored underground comix published between the 1970s and 1990s (Robbins 2016), to *Comics for Choice*, a contemporary collection of short comics that explore personal and political stories about abortion (Newlevant, Taylor, and Fox 2017). These largely autobiographical comics use the cross-discursive and nonlinear structure of comics to call attention to the subjective and contested nature of time and memory. The arguments I ultimately present in this piece—that the comics medium encourages reflexive and situated writing, facilitates the circulation of contested narratives, and manipu-

---

3. Kuttner, Sousanis, and Weaver-Hightower (2018) define comics-based research as "a broad set of practices that use the comics form to collect, analyze, and/or disseminate scholarly research" (397).

lates time and space to create new connections—grew directly from these early observations.

While my piece argues for the many epistemological and pedagogical benefits of comics-based research, this form of scholarship also presents undeniable challenges—including the time-intensive process of planning, scripting, thumbnailing, sketching, erasing, inking, scanning, lettering, and coloring. Beyond the individual challenges of learning and executing scholarship in this form, comics-based research also presents material and procedural challenges to standard academic practices, including citation practices, peer review, and publication processes.[4] This form of research also brings up important questions about the longterm accessibility of multimodal scholarship; the expansion of comics-based research will require urgent and creative collaboration between scholars, editors, and publishers to ensure that comics-based research is accessible to assistive technology devices and translation services. Critical discussions about process and access are central to expanding and deepening comics-based research methodologies.

Despite the challenges that come with this work, the enormous potential of comics storytelling makes refining and reforming the processes of comics-based research worthwhile. As I hope this piece demonstrates, comics offer a theoretically, pedagogically, and rhetorically complex medium for creating and sharing feminist academic work. For feminist scholars, comics-based research offers an opportunity to not only question uninterrogated conventions of academic writing, but also to create new works that center questions of authorship, contested narrative, and temporality from the form up.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. Did you respond to this piece of scholarship differently because it was written in the comics medium? How did your reading, notetaking, and discussion practices change when reading scholarship written in comics form?

2. What new audiences might comics-based scholarship create? What audiences might it discourage?

3. How did having an embodied narrator shape the argument of this piece? How would the piece be different if the narrator did not appear?

4. How could you apply the comics storytelling tools discussed in this piece to a different research topic?

---

4. For a discussion of some of the writing and editing challenges of comics scholarship, see Salter, Whitson, and Helms (2018).

Works Cited

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*: 39–67.

—. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–99.

Kuttner, Paul J., Nick Sousanis, and Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower. 2018. "Drawing Comics the Scholarly Way: Creating Comics-Based Research in the Academy." In *Handbook of Arts-Based Research*, edited by Patricia Leavy, 396-422. New York: Guilford Press.

Livholts, Mona. 2012. *Emergent Writing Methodologies in Feminist Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Newlevant, Hazel, Whit Taylor, and Ø.K. Fox, eds. 2017. *Comics for Choice*. USA: Open Source Publishing.

Robbins, Trina, ed. 2016. *The Complete Wimmen's Comix*. Seattle, WA: Fantagraphics.

Salter, Anastasia, Roger Whitson, and Jason Helms. 2018. "Making 'Comics as Scholarship': A Reflection on the Process Behind *Digital Humanities Quarterly* (9) 4." *Kairos* 23 (1). http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/23.1/inventio/salter-et-al/.

Supplemental Material

"Making Citizens Behind Bars (and the Stories We Tell About It): Queering Approaches to Prison Literacy Programs"

Alexandra Cavallaro

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

Like most ideas of mine, this article has its origins in a coffee shop, in a moment of frustration, and required someone else to point out that what I just said was the basis for my next research project. I had just finished my dissertation on literacy and rhetorical education in the LGBTQ community, and I was sick of it. I had no desire to look at it ever again. "What I really want to do," I told my friend, "is focus on prisons. I wish that people in the field who work at the intersection of Rhet/Comp and queer studies also studied prisons, but I'm not finding anything." I had been volunteering for the Education Justice Project, tutoring writing in a men's prison and teaching two upper-division college writing courses. This work was so much more immediate to me, and I wanted to integrate it into my scholarship as I moved into my first faculty position. I found that the concerns and stories of the incarcerated men I worked with would not leave me alone, and I had no desire to set them aside. She looked at me in that way that only a good friend can and gently pointed out that I had just articulated my next project. "Um, *you* could do that work," she said. Oh. I could, couldn't I?

While this article came out of a desire to unite my research on queer literacies and prison education, without the often invisible labor of others—of friends, colleagues, and incarcerated people—this article would not have become what it is. From that first moment in a coffee shop to the final edits, I benefitted enormously from the generosity of others, people who read drafts in many forms, who listened while I talked through ideas, and who modeled the kind of scholarship I wanted to do. And while it is important I acknowledge all of these friends and colleagues, it is especially important to acknowledge that the origins of this piece are also linked to my connections with the many incarcerated people I have had the privilege of working with. Their invisible labor is particularly important to acknowledge because they are confined in a system that is designed to keep them silent and hidden and steals their labor in multiple ways. This happens with their wage labor (they generally make less than a dollar an hour) and in the restrictions on and theft of their intellectual labor. I am grateful for the readership of this piece, but I am saddened and angered that you will not get to read the work of so many

others, like my former student, Rob, who responded to a call for journal entries from the Anne Frank Foundation. Internal Affairs confiscated his work, and he was given two choices: either destroy the journal or face additional investigation and disciplinary action (most likely, time in segregation). Days later, his journal was shredded. Such an experience is not an uncommon one for incarcerated people. These are the people and stories that formed the tapestry of this article, that prompted me to find ways that prison education could resist, rather than support, a violent prison system.

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

One of the challenges of studying prison education programs in any kind of systemic or comprehensive way is the lack of publicly available information and the wide variety in the type of programs offered. When I found Rebecca Ginsburg and Victoria Bryan's "Higher Education in Jails and Prison Programming List," it was a researcher's dream. At the time, it contained information on 149 programs across the United States. From that list, I selected 54 programs across 25 states for analysis, choosing programs with publicly available information and a literacy education component. My analysis was guided by queer critiques of the prison industrial complex, and I examined programs' language for where they put their focus: individual responsibility (through an emphasis on personal accountability and bootstraps narratives), a systemic critique (usually through an emphasis on the systemic inequalities that cause incarceration), or a combination of the two.

As I did this research, I found myself frustrated with the limited ways that prison education programs articulated visions for their work. The vast majority of programs focus on individual responsibility, rehabilitation, and recidivism. When they do, it limits what I know to be the more radical potential of prison education. Since taking on a new role as the director of a center that supports research on prison education, facilitates programming in prison, and hosts trainings for prison educators, I have used the findings that emerged from this research project to build the list of values that appears in the article and that have guided my work since.

Of course, applying these principles to educational programming in prison has not been without its challenges. These values emphasize reflection on power structures, agency for incarcerated people, and reciprocal/mutual learning, all things that the operations of the prison industrial complex does not value. For example, one of the values is that programming should be open to all people, regardless of length of sentence. As it currently stands, the facility we teach in does not allow those with a life sentence to participate.

They simply will not allow them into our classes. These tensions highlight my ultimate goal for prison education work—not to build better programs, but to make the need for this work, to borrow from the great Angela Davis, "obsolete" through prison abolition.

Part III: Discussion Questions

Many readers of this article may not work in prison contexts, but it is my hope that this work may prompt you to think about how you can extend this work into other contexts. The questions posed by this work need not be limited to prison education.

1. This article argues that the notion of citizenship is particularly fraught for incarcerated people because they are denied many of the things that we have come to associate with the privileges of citizenship. Where else do we see notions of citizenship similarly complicated outside of prison contexts?

2. The "Guiding Values" of the Community Writing Collective in prison poses several key questions: what can we learn from each other? Who are our audiences? What materials and methods best relate our concerns and ideas? What can we *hear* from inside a prison? What can we *say* from inside a prison? What conditions shape our writing and thinking? Think about the contexts where you write (in classrooms, in communities, at home). What do these questions illuminate for you?

3. Whose invisible labor shapes your own work? Why is that work invisible and what are the consequences of that work remaining invisible? What could and should we do to make it visible, and what would be gained by doing so?

Supplemental Material

"The Adaptive Cycle: Resilience in the History of First-Year Composition"

Clancy Ratliff

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

Donald Murray has famously said that all writing is autobiography. I can see his point in all the writing I have done, but most of all in my work about writing program administration, which is thoroughly situated in time and place. I started teaching at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette as a pre-tenure WPA in fall 2007. The state's universities were still reeling from the damage caused by Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita; the exodus of students in New Orleans's universities (University of New Orleans, Southern University New Orleans, Xavier University, Tulane University, Loyola University New Orleans, Dillard University, University of Holy Cross, and Nunez and Delgado Community Colleges) and sudden spike in enrollment at nearby Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge Community College, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, South Louisiana Community College, and other institutions meant that, at least at UL Lafayette, first-year M.A. students who hadn't yet met the SACS requirement of eighteen hours of graduate coursework in the discipline were enlisted to teach Basic Writing their first semester in the program, and enrollment caps in FYW increased from 25 to 27 in Fall 2005: a "temporary," "emergency" increase that was still in place in Fall 2007. It took us years to get it reinstated to 25. In sum, we experienced austerity early.

Then, that next semester--Spring 2008--the global market collapsed, and Louisiana suffered the most drastic budget cuts to higher education in the nation. The governor, state legislators, and administrators at the University of Louisiana system level and UL Lafayette university level were desperate to cut costs by any means necessary. The legislature passed the GRAD Act, which stood for "Granting Resources and Autonomy for Degrees," and it provided an opportunity for universities to replace the funding they lost from the state by increasing tuition. Because they had to increase the graduation rate to qualify for permission to raise tuition, they had an incentive to grant general education credit to more students so that they would be more likely to complete a degree, and to do so faster. Naturally, six of those general education credit hours were FYW, so I was close to ground zero of the austerity crisis of the last dozen years. I saw more and more students getting FYW

credit. I read the collection *Composition in the Age of Austerity* with great interest, and when I saw a call for proposals for a special issue of *Pedagogy* on the theme of resilience, edited by the same editors of *Composition in the Age of Austerity* and seen as a next step from that collection, I believed I could contribute. I talked to my good friend from graduate school, Amy Propen, about theories of resilience from environmental studies, and she recommended an edited collection titled *The Post-Carbon Reader*. I read it, and in William Rees's chapter on resilience, I encountered the idea of the adaptive cycle as applied to both nature and economics, and I was struck by how plausibly it could be mapped onto the history of FYW. I'd like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the help of the reviewers and the editors, especially Chris Gallagher, who really put me through the paces with regard to revision, but who strengthened the essay immensely.

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

The experience of writing "The Adaptive Cycle" has had a lot of influence on my teaching and my thinking about FYW and college writing in general. In my reflections about FYW and all the reading and thought experiments and exercises I did while writing the article, it occurred to me that FYW classrooms are possibly the place with the most diverse group of students in higher education. Yet, in graduate faculty meetings, we cast about for ways to increase diversity in our M.A. and Ph.D. programs, in departments that have them. (I had a one-year interim stint as Director of Graduate Studies recently. Again, all writing is autobiography.) In other words, in English studies, we start out with the most diverse group of students in the university, FYW, and end up with one of the least diverse, graduate students. What we need to be doing is *keeping* the diversity *we already have* in FYW by sufficiently supporting and mentoring FYW students. We need to have a critical view of FYW's perpetuation of writerly whiteness and turn to the practices of *discursive homeplacing* and *safe harboring*, set forth by Karen Keaton Jackson, Hope Jackson, and Dawn Hicks Tafari. Their article was published after "The Adaptive Cycle," but I strongly believe that in the time FYW has left, we must be as kind, supportive, encouraging, and empowering as possible while we serve students. We must have full and radical faith, trust, and confidence in them as writers and intellectuals. That means practices like grading contracts, as well as thinking big about accessibility and inclusion for students with disabilities. I don't know if FYW is really going out of higher education or not, but in any case, we should learn from its successes and failures.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. Are rumors of First-Year Writing's demise greatly exaggerated? What might be some arguments that more students are taking FYW?
2. If we are in the release phase, how much longer will it last? How might another recession in the wake of COVID-19 affect FYW's place in higher education?
3. How will these developments change composition research and its implications for pedagogy?
4. How has enrollment in Basic Writing and Second Language Writing courses been affected, if at all?

Works Cited

Jackson, Karen Keaton, Hope Jackson, and Dawn N. Hicks Tafari. "We Belong in the Discussion: Including HBCUs in Conversations about Race and Writing." C*ollege Composition and Communication,* vol. 71, no. 2, 2019, pp. 184-214.

Supplemental Material

"Learning to Value Cultural Wealth Through Service Learning: Farmworker Families' and Latina/o University Students' Mutual Empowerment via Freirean and Feminist Chicana/o- Latina/o Literature Reading Circles"

Georgina Guzmán

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

This essay is the product of over 200 California State University Channel Islands students' service-learning efforts leading bilingual reading circles with Latina/o farmworkers in Ventura County, CA. My roles in this service-learning project were as planner, mediator, midwife, and scribe, and these experiences changed my life and career forever. Indeed, as I sat in my folding chair in the community room inside the farmworker family housing projects, the words of Mark Twain rang in my head: "*the two most important days in your life are the day you are born and the day you find out why*." That day I found out what I was born to do--bridge the university and the community and help empower students and farmworkers alike. This essay encapsulates everything I hoped to achieve when I took this job as an English professor at a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) surrounded by agricultural fields and workers. I wanted to be of service to the Latina/os working in the fields (whom I witness laboring under the sun while on my way to my air-conditioned office). And I wanted to be of service to my mostly Latina/o students who must also navigate systemic racism despite having made their way into the university.

As an English professor, I strive to use literature as a vehicle to enable people to arrive at social consciousness and begin to imagine--begin to believe in their agency-- to change the world. The very reason I wrote this essay was precisely to document how literature and dialogue enabled my students and our community members to attain profound awakenings into consciousness. I wanted to capture their powerful stories and provide a model of service learning that could be replicated in other parts of the country with the aim of contributing to a larger social movement that seeks to interrogate systems of oppression and dismantle social inequalities.

As a literary scholar, I had never written anything like this essay—I had never written about real-time teaching on the ground. But as I saw community members become activists and my students fired up and going on to graduate school programs, the impact of our reading circles became so glaringly powerful. We had attained something here and I realized that if I

didn't write these stories down, they would evaporate into forgotten history. It was upon reaching this realization that the words came in torrents; it was then that the writing came effortlessly and organically, as if my brain and body just needed to let everything out-- to tell the whole world what we had accomplished and how they could do it too. I strived to tell our story in efforts of disseminating its power.

Re-reading this essay in June 2020, in the wake of the heinous murder of George Floyd by Minneapolis PD and the communal uprisings against systemic racism and police brutality against people of color everywhere that it sparked--from Minneapolis to Oxnard, CA-- I believe it was small acts of raising consciousness at the community level such as ours that enabled us to arrive at this larger social movement today. And I am proud of that.

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

In this essay, I draw from several critical frameworks in order to analyze my students' service-learning experiences: 1) Paulo Freire's theorization of developing non-hierarchical, "horizontal relationships" between teacher and student, 2) Tara Yosso's concept of "community cultural wealth," which counters notions of deficit-thinking about minority communities, and 3) Latina Feminist pedagogical strategies of *testimonio* to develop a safe space in the classroom by modeling vulnerability and creating trust, kinship, reciprocity, and commitment. My rigorous and sustained examination of these three critical pedagogies in this essay led me to be more mindful and intentional about implementing them within my classroom.

For me, writing this essay taught me the importance of listening to every student's story (in the classroom and in the community) and empowering them to create, transmit, and facilitate knowledge-production that is socially relevant to their lives. In class, I am more mindful now about modeling how I would like my students to teach their future students, whether they be in the community or an educational institution: I encourage them to lead book discussions and prompt them to share their own stories. I ask students to write their own questions and concerns about the readings on the whiteboard during the first five minutes of class. I then let those questions guide our conversations. When we discuss class readings, I ask them, "how would you lead a discussion of this text if you were teaching it to your 80-year-old Mexican grandmother? What are some key themes or concepts you need to explain and go over in order to discuss the readings with her?" This is also my subtle way of helping bridge the classroom with the family living room and helping my first-generation college students overcome the alienation that they can sometimes feel at home and at school. Plus, placing the onus of pedagogy on

the students helps them develop their own self-esteem and strength as pedagogues in their own right.

I have also found new meaning in the power of *writing* our stories. Listening to the farmworker women, we learned so many of their impactful life stories. I wish we had the capacity to write them down in Spanish, but that is a task in the works. However, what I have been able to do in my Chicana/o-Latina/o Literature class is create a critical autoethnography writing assignment for my students. They must tell their personal stories with a critical lens in order to not just tell their life narrative, but also analyze the significance of their formative life experiences. This writing assignment has been very fruitful and cathartic for students. It oftentimes helps them value their lives, their parents, and their communities. Or not. Sometimes in the process of writing, students learn to critique the patriarchy, racism, colorism, mental colonization, and homophobia that has afflicted them their whole lives.

By reading my students' life stories, I have also grown to develop a pedagogy of compassion and empathy. Students today have overcome life obstacles that I could not even imagine having to go through, and yet, they persevere and shine bright; they inspire me to keep on going. With the COVID-19 pandemic, what has been hardest for me is not being able to be in the classroom creating community with them. And the future of service-learning is uncertain amidst the pandemic. But I find optimism in remembering that our communities have survived many painful historical events and we will continue to survive and thrive no matter what.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. How can service-learning provide students unique opportunities for meaningful writing, thinking, and reflection in a way that non service-learning classes cannot?
2. Why wouldn't Latina/o college students from farmworker or working-class backgrounds necessarily jump at the opportunity of participating in service-learning with the farmworker community? What does this reflect about their ideas about college?
3. There are many excerpts from student reflection papers included in this essay. Which reflections did you find most moving? Why? How did students' views of the farmworker women change and why?
4. How can service-learning practitioners ensure that service-learning is reciprocal, non-hierarchical, and benefits both parties involved?
5. After reading this essay, what kinds of service-learning partnerships can you envision creating? What community needs are you interested in addressing? Why? Is there any institutional support you can tap into?

Supplemental Material

"'All Smell is Disease'; Miasma, Sensory Rhetoric, and the Sanitary-Bacteriologic of Visceral Public Health"

Emily Winderman, Robert Mejia, and Brandon Rogers

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

We are delighted to reflect upon the origin of this piece because the serendipity of its creation stands as a productive model for cross-disciplinary engagement and co-authored scholarship. In November 2016, Emily Winderman and Robert Mejia were participants in a National Communication Association discussion panel grappling with the rhetoric and politics of the Zika virus. Between 2015 and 2017, the Zika virus was dominating U.S. news, largely because of pervasive images of infants born with microcephaly. After the 2016 discussion panel was positively received, plans for a 2017 reunion emerged. For 2017, each panelist was randomly buddied up with another panelist to complete a comparative historical analysis of Zika and another epidemic. Emily and Robert were assigned a typhoid/Zika comparison and immediately went to work.

Following our presentation that had many of the seedlings of the essay in its current form, we applied for our paper to be considered for publication in the "Public Health" special issue of *Rhetoric of Health & Medicine.* At that point, Brandon Rogers was Emily's graduate assistant and provided such important contributions to the piece that we gladly invited him aboard as a co-author.

Ultimately, this piece serves as a testament to the virtues of co-authorship in the humanities. Passing the piece back and forth over several rounds of revision made the essay stronger because we had to grapple with our divergent theoretical equipment as we worked to fulfill the editorial guidance. Ensuring that the essay read in a somewhat unified voice required frequent conversations and trust in one another's vision. We are so grateful that our essay was selected for inclusion in this collection because writing it is now a fond memory that marks the beginning of a friendship and, hopefully, future essays.

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

As a cross-disciplinary collaboration between media studies and rhetoric of health and medicine, our methods were both critical and rhetorical. For a

theoretical framework, we fused Jenell Johnson's visceral publicity and David S. Barnes' sanitary-bacteriological synthesis in order to situate and explain the circulation of public health related messages.

There were a number of methodological challenges that we faced in our task of comparing typhoid with Zika. In order to productively compare two disease epidemics separated by a century, we leaned on Debra Hawhee and Christa Olson's work on panhistoriography, which allows scholars to account for phenomena separated by even several centuries. Furthermore, because olfaction is difficult to capture in textual form, our analysis examined olfaction through the visual print medium and attended to compositional elements of the frame and the avenues of the image circulation.

The connective logic between typhoid and Zika is the sanitary-bacteriological synthesis, by which a certain sensation was the primary means for observing whether or not someone had a disease and were therefore dangerous. The same kind of logic inheres in the way we continue to talk about people affected with Zika. The sanitary-bacteriological synthesis functions within the context of systemic racism in global health efforts and therefore traffics in racist, classist, and gendered stereotypes, regardless of the time period we were examining.

Writing this essay has impacted our pedagogy by allowing us to be more creative with our comparative analyses. It is important that the comparison be careful and apt, but we should also not shy away from juxtaposing phenomena that are seemingly too divergent. This did not make for a more holistic piece (as in an additive interpretation) which is perhaps how a scientist or social scientist would perceive collaboration; rather, it made for a more nuanced piece (as in a dialectic interpretation), which attempted to recognize the similarities and differences between two epidemics.

For instance, the historical and geographic contexts surrounding Typhoid and Zika affected the racial rhetorics that are evinced through the iconography of Mary Mallon and Tianara Lourenco. Typhoid emerges in that historical moment when the Irish are becoming White. "Typhoid Mary" Mallon is thus figured metonymically as a potential threat to this racial transformation. Tianara Lourenco is thus figured synecdochally as a representation of the perceived medical threat of racial difference. What Mallon and Lourenco thus illustrated for us is that for matters of public health, poor, ethnic women are figured as vectors of disease transmission, in contrast to wealthier white women who are figured as victims of disease. These insights were made stronger because of our collaborative scholarship and thus pedagogically have taught us to think more purposefully about the benefits and processes of collaborative work.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. How can smell be rhetorical? What role does smell play in rhetorical processes of racialization?

2. The authors rely on visual rhetoric to trace olfactory rhetoric. Can you think of some other rhetorical ways to analyze olfaction without relying on the visual?

3. How does the claim that the social judgments made possible by miasmatism (a historical disease rhetoric) was never fully abdicated, but instead blended into germ theory (a contemporary disease rhetoric) help us to understand why an understanding of history matters for the analysis of contemporary social problems (p. 122)? What other social problems (whether health or otherwise) would benefit from the insight of historical knowledge?

4. As a disease that also spreads asymptomatically, what types of sensory rhetoric are found in public discussions of COVID-19?

Supplemental Material

"Building Sustainable WAC Programs: A Whole Systems Approach"

Michelle Cox, Jeffrey Galin, and Dan Melzer

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

This work began from two concerns by the authors: the need for a guide for building WAC programs that addresses current and complex contexts in higher education, and the concern that WAC programs fail at an alarming rate. The authors originally intended to write a kind of "how to" book for building WAC programs, but as we reviewed the literature we realized that what was missing in WAC was a robust theory and methodology for developing programs. Much of the guidance for developing WAC programs was based on lore, and there was a lot of wise and helpful advice, but it wasn't necessarily informed by a coherent theory or methodology, with the exception of Barbara Walvoord's article "The Future of WAC," which draws on social movement theory. We found inspiration for our theory and methodology as we read various complexity theories. Each theory of complexity we integrated provided a different affordance: systems theory helped us think about the macro level of WAC work and ways to transform institutional cultures of writing, social network theory provided methods for analyzing more micro relationships within systems, resilience theory helped us understand how WAC programs can manage stress and function within sustainable ranges over time, and sustainable development theory helped us conceive of a WAC program as a series of projects that aim for sustainable growth. Sustainable development theory also provided us with models for our "understand, plan, development, lead" methodology, the concept of sustainability indicators, and principles for sustainable growth that we revised and adopted for the purposes of WAC program building. Our project evolved from a simple "how to" guide to a complex process of theory-building and synthesis.

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

Our research methods focused primarily on synthesis. The various theoretical and methodological approaches to complexity that we included are not often explicitly in conversation with each other, so one goal was to make connections among these various complexity theories as well as to show how they can complement each other for the purposes of program development. There was also a great deal of translation of these theories for WAC program

development. Complexity theories grew out of engineering, computer science, and environmental and social science, and although education scholars have considered the relevance of complexity theories for educational institutions, these theories had not been applied to WAC programs. Another aspect of our research method was theory building. As we synthesized the various complexity theories, we also consciously developed principles, strategies, and a methodology for building sustainable WAC programs that we hope provide a new theoretical approach, albeit one grounded in prior theories of complexity. Despite all this emphasis on theory, we also wanted to make the connection between theory and practice, so we put out a national call for vignettes from WAC directors and integrated these vignettes throughout our book *Sustainable WAC*. Although there was not room to include WAC program vignettes in this article, they inform our thinking about concrete strategies.

Our research has had a significant impact on our work as program directors. We have found ourselves acting more slowly and deliberately as we develop our programs and consider new projects, dwelling on the "understanding" stage and trying to understand the full context before we act. We have also become more deliberate about working across institutional stakeholders and finding ways to gather stakeholders across the institution in our programs and in our decision-making. We have become more strategic in our approaches to program development, and we are more focused on developing projects that have both impact and potential for sustainability. We are also more aware of how much time we are spending at the micro and macro levels of institutions. And at least two of us have begun to analyze our own programs for sustainability indicators.

We have also applied the WSA in positions as leaders in WAC as a field. As co-chairs (with Anne Ellen Geller) of the International Network of Writing Across the Curriculum Programs, we instigated a discussion at CCCC and IWAC of the potential of a national organization for WAC. Our primary goal was to help WAC's sustainability as the founders of the WAC movement retire. We see a connection between our research for this article and our book *Sustainable WAC* and the initial conversations that led to the formation of the CCCC WAC Standing Group and the Association for Writing Across the Curriculum.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. How does the WSA differ from other approaches to writing program development and administration?

2. What types of WAC initiatives would you prioritize at your current institution for greatest impact and sustainability?

3. How can the WSA principles be applied to other types of writing programs (FYC, writing centers, independent writing programs, graduate writing support programs, etc.)?

4. What is the main challenge confronting your WAC program? How might you draw on the WSA methodology or strategies to address this challenge?

Supplemental Material

"The Role of New Media Expertise in Shaping Consultations"

Jessica Celements

Part I: Reflection on the Origins of the Article

Fresh out of graduate school, I was hell-bent on ensuring those around me understood that writing no longer exclusively comprises word-based, print-based genres, that effective twenty-first century communication, in fact, is predicated on one's facility with connecting to networked assemblages of diverse audiences through adept multimodal composing choices. As a new assistant professor I was given the opportunity to reinvent the writing center at my small liberal arts college in the Pacific Northwest, and I, naively, assumed the students would already be "with me" in this regard. They *were* "with me" in the sense that they responded well to visual rhetoric education; they could well articulate how compositional design choices worked through visual hierarchy to communicate a rhetorical message to an audience. They even qualified exploring multimodal forms of communication as a valuable, eye-opening experience, one that created empathy for clients who might struggle to engage with a particular type or kind of academic writing. What I wasn't prepared for, however, was the metaphorical backchannel of resistance to multimodal consulting in practice. Consultants would engage with the occasional writer who brought a PowerPoint presentation or InDesign poster to the Commons, but I could see the fear in their eyes whenever I asked who was ready to lead the next Composing with Adobe InDesign workshop. They did not desire ownership of their roles as technology-rich writing experts. I desired to explore this conundrum in a systematic way.

Blessed with a richly rigorous rhetorical education from Purdue University, I knew I would need to design research that was replicable, aggregable, and data-driven if I wanted it to be taken seriously by the field as a whole. Turning to Dinitz and Harrington's "The Role of Disciplinary Expertise in Shaping Writing Tutorials" was an easy choice given how neatly multimodal composing fits into the continua of generalist vs. specialist writing tutor theory the authors were exploring; multimodal composing is, indeed, a "special" form of composing. I enlisted the help of my consultants in the data gathering and transcribing phases and am grateful for their open and honest reflections along the way. When the theme of "confidence" arose through careful data analysis, it was a lightbulb moment for me. I had found something specific to focus on when addressing this theory to practice disparity in

future professionalization opportunities with my consultants. Finally, I have always had a passion for pedagogy, so practical applications were a "must" for fleshing out this article, which went through at least 7 rounds of revision. I am proud to have the results published in not only the May/June 2019 special issue of *WLN* but also the *How We Teach Writing Tutors* digital edited collection, https://wlnjournal.org/digitaleditedcollection1/Clements.html, an exceptional resource that all writing center practitioners should check out.

Part II: Description of Research Methods, Findings, and/or Pedagogical Impact

Navigating this research project helped me to actualize a growing desire for formalized ongoing professionalization opportunities for my writing center consultants. EL 421: Writing Center II (a one-credit practicum required of all currently employed writing tutors) now exists at my institution. I am fortunate to have this opportunity to meet weekly with my consultants to discuss pressing topics affecting their daily work in the Composition Commons, such as working effectively with writers engaging in multimodal composing. Since the Fall 2018 inception of EL 421, we have tackled the "Visual Rhetoric in Practice" (VRP) project versions 2-5: VRP remix, Adobe InDesign instruction set, writing center social media memes, and consultant manual revision (well-designed edition).

Outside of directly impacting my praxis in this way, the project sparked a string of scholarly projects focused directly on writing center pedagogy. My colleague, librarian and Director of Instructional Services Marianne Stowell Bracke, and I penned "It Takes a Village: Assembling Meaningful Access to Information Literacy through Library-Writing Center Partnerships." The chapter, which is forthcoming in *Advances in Library Practices in Higher Education: International Perspectives on Improving Student Engagement*, details our case study in which we jointly introduced writing center consultants to the ACRL Information Literacy Framework, how information is created, and strategies to help writing center clients with source evaluation; in this chapter, we forward our theory that assembling meaningful access to information literacy involves integrating the expertise of a wide variety of stakeholders, each tasked with facilitating a more pointed look at a smaller piece of the information literacy puzzle to an audience with whom they can best relate. I also recently finished final edits on "The Quest for Intersectional Awareness: Educating Tutors through Gaming Ethnography," a chapter which is forthcoming in Unlimited Players: The Intersections of Writing Center and Game Studies. In this chapter, I investigate the affordances of intersectional tutor

education as effectively accomplished through game studies methodology: a gamer's autoethnography.

I, of course, have not completely solved the conundrum of waning confidence in multimodal composition consultation. At the March 2019 IWCA Collaborative in Pittsburgh, I presented a project-in-progress titled "Affective Bridges: Emotional Overload and the Professionalization of the Undergraduate Writing Tutor." In this presentation, I explored how continued education, writ large, was perceived by consultants to require too much—too much time, energy, and intellectual/emotional investment—prompting the following research questions: How/does the emotional labor of daily consulting affect undergraduate tutors' willingness to engage in extra-consulting endeavors? And, how should a director respond to such consultant exacerbation given emotionally dissonant feelings? I hope to continue to explore these questions in future research as well as to dive into how interdisciplinary approaches to documentation and assessment might reveal more productive means to probing such writing center phenomena.

Part III: Discussion Questions

1. How can generalist and specialist writing consultants best support multimodal composition in diverse writing center contexts, including a/synchronous virtual consulting?
2. What are readily accessible resources for facilitating multimodal composition tutor education as technology, and technology-rich forms of composing, continue to evolve?
3. How might writing center directors combat their own hesitancies toward technology-rich composition or lack of confidence in multimodal composition expertise to facilitate writing center professionalization opportunities surrounding new media more efficiently?
4. What intersectional variables may be influencing consultant and client engagement with multimodal composition in addition to expertise and confidence?
5. How might documentation and assessment strategies be interrogated in order to assist a writing center in productively moving forward with multimodal composition support?