

Anne Ruggles Gere, Anne Curzan, J. W. Hammond,
Sarah Hughes, Ruth Li, Andrew Moos, Kendon Smith,
Kathryn Van Zanen, Kelly L. Wheeler, and Crystal J.
Zanders

Communal Justicing: Writing Assessment, Disciplinary Infrastructure, and the Case for Critical Language Awareness

Critical language awareness offers one approach to communal *justicing*, an iterative and collective process that can address inequities in the disciplinary infrastructure of Writing Studies. We demonstrate justicing in the field's pasts, policies, and publications; offer a model of communal revision; and invite readers to become agents of communal justicing.

Introduction

In this essay, we take up John Duffy's challenge to Writing Studies scholars that despite the goals articulated in field-orienting documents such as the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* and the Council of Writing Program Administrators' (WPA) *Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition*, "we have yet to offer a common vision, a shared rationale for our work" (10). We¹ argue that critical language awareness should shape our common vision. At the heart of every composition course is the production and assessment of language-based texts, and critical language awareness offers a proactive response to standard language ideologies and the negative consequences these ideologies have long authorized: ranking and sorting

CCC 72:3 / FEBRUARY 2021

students in discriminatory ways. Contributing to ongoing efforts to disrupt the inertia of the discipline's discriminatory pasts, we advance a common vision for critical language awareness in writing assessment by revising the "Developing Knowledge of Conventions" section of the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*. By sharing our thinking as well as its product, we aim to invite others to participate in similar projects of communal revision. We imagine these efforts as participating in communal *justicing*: the ongoing, iterative, and collective project of working toward justice.

Standard language ideologies have embedded injustice in many of the policies and publications that guide writing instruction and assessment. These ideologies privilege certain forms of language as "correct," "better," or "commonsensical." Privileged forms are codified and enforced as "standard," while the language varieties and discursive patterns of less privileged groups receive discrimination and ridicule. Critical language awareness enables instructors and their students to investigate and understand both how discourse operates and, in the words of Keith Gilyard, "how the dominant or most powerful discourse serves to regulate and reproduce patterns of privilege" (True, 142). This includes exploration of language change, historical processes of standardization, distinctions between descriptive and prescriptive grammars, and an awareness that terms like "conventions" are grounded in standard language ideologies.

Challenging standard language ideologies requires what we call communal *justicing*. We offer this neologism as a parallel to the term *linguaging*, defined by Merrill Swain as "the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language" (98). Like *linguaging*, *justicing* implies a process of conscious, iterative effort that is not achieved all at once, but rather depends upon the choices we continually make. *Justicing* also invokes Mya Poe et al.'s assertion that "writing assessment best serves students when justice is taken as the ultimate aim of assessment" (5). We emphasize that meaningfully pursuing this aim requires making structural interventions; local action is necessary but is not in itself sufficient. For justicing in Writing Studies to be sustainable and scalable, its target

Critical language awareness enables instructors and their students to investigate and understand both how discourse operates and, in the words of Keith Gilyard, "how the dominant or most powerful discourse serves to regulate and reproduce patterns of privilege" (True, 142).

must extend to the field's assessment "infrastructure"—the disciplinary codes, conditions, and conventions that guide practice and shape how knowledge in the field is created, curated, and circulated.² This disciplinary infrastructure includes (but is not limited to) the *pasts* that provide the field its historical memory, the *policies* that structure disciplinary norms and imperatives, and the *publications* that provide the field a way to publicize innovations and organize intellectual commitments. To change the disciplinary infrastructure that shapes assessment, justicing must be *communal*: we all need to participate in the revision of the pasts, policies, and publications on which writing assessment depends. Reimagining our guiding documents so that they advance critical language awareness is one such infrastructural intervention—one such means of justicing.

While racial injustice is by no means the only form of injustice structured into writing assessment, we focus on it in this article as a way both to build on recent related research (e.g., Green; Inoue, *Antiracist*; Inoue and Poe; Poe and Cogan) and to model the kind of work communal justicing might entail. We begin this article by defining communal justicing and its relationship to assessing writing. Then we examine key moments in the disciplinary history of writing assessment, illuminating the racism and language-based discrimination that have foundationally shaped it. Next, we describe an understanding of language that provides a basis for justicing assessment-related policies, distinguishing critical language awareness from language awareness more generally. All of this leads up to our revision of the "Developing Knowledge of Conventions" section of the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, which we offer as an example of justicing via communal revision. We conclude by pointing to additional sites for moving the project of justicing forward.

Justicing Assessment as Communal Infrastructural Intervention

Because social justice is an established topic in Writing Studies scholarship, we preface discussion of our work by clarifying the term *communal justicing*. In keeping with the teachings of critical race and social justice theorists (e.g., Bonilla-Silva; M. Matsuda et al.; Young), we understand social injustice not as a set of individual biases and cruelties, but instead as a set of structural relationships that stratify society in injurious ways. As a structural matter, justice can be understood as something we partly make and remake

through the relationships we inhabit and reinforce; justice, in other words, is the product of justicing.³ Though individual action can participate in this project, we take the term *communal* justicing to designate something more than local efforts to revise aspects of assessment that contribute to unjust outcomes for students. Agents of communal justicing also seek to revise the disciplinary infrastructure of writing assessment by intervening in the historical narratives, policies, and publications that shape and orient us as a field—thereby increasing attention to our shared responsibility to promote educational equity and to our shared complicity in the field’s failure to secure it. Communal justicing seeks to weave this project into the core fabric of Writing Studies, including documents like the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*.

In the past decade, a growing number of writing assessment scholars have taken up questions of social justice, paying particular attention to racial justice and inequity (e.g., Green; Inoue, *Antiracist* and “Racial Methodologies”; Poe and Inoue; Poe et al.). Norbert Elliot argues that constraining the construct of writing (through multiple choice testing, for instance) is unethical to the extent that it fails to benefit “the least advantaged,” including racially and linguistically minoritized students (“Theory” §3.0). Asao B. Inoue reframes assessment as a kind of racialized ecology that often privileges whiteness (*Antiracist*). And Mya Poe and John Aloysius Cogan, Jr. show how demographic data disaggregation can reveal assessment’s disparate impacts (see also, e.g., Banks et al.; Elliot, “Theory”). Expanding on and systematizing developments like these, communal justicing seeks to introduce changes to the shared disciplinary infrastructure that partly shapes how local actors enact writing assessment. Inaction within an unjust system perpetuates that system by leaving it unopposed. We have a responsibility to critique ourselves and those “with whom we share responsibility” (Young 144). Taking part in a community means we must share that community’s responsibilities—and challenge our colleagues to do so as well. We need to address the exigency John Duffy describes: “we have many languages, but no common language; many stories, but no shared narrative about the significance of the work we have undertaken” (143). Reconsidering the narrative of language-based discrimination in the history of writing assessment can help to make clear both responsibility for justicing and possible strategies for this work. This history is discussed next.

The Need for Critical (Re-)Examination of Writing Assessment's Pasts

Historical scholarship in writing assessment (e.g., Elliot's *On a Scale*) can help expose entrenched structural injustices by drawing attention to the "normative fixations" and values that underpin writing assessment (Banks et al. 381). That exposure opens a space where we can consider how even seemingly "progressive" or well-intentioned disciplinary positions can permit or perpetuate injustice (see also Flowers; Hammond, *Composing* and "Toward"; Harms; Inoue, "How"; Kynard; Ruiz). Probing and revising the disciplinary past of writing assessment can help reveal where critical language awareness has been absent and where it can more meaningfully be incorporated.

Standard language ideologies and racism figured prominently in the establishment of writing assessment in schooling in the United States, even when writing was presumed to be a fairer form of assessment for a broad population of students. Horace Mann, best known as a nineteenth-century reformer instrumental in establishing what would become K–12 public education, introduced the technology of standardized writing exams (to replace oral exams) in assessing student learning in 1845, responding to concerns that the prevailing oral exams were unfair (Mann; see also Hammond, *Composing*; Lynne). In standardizing written examinations, Mann and his team of examiners advanced what Lesley Milroy calls "a single correct written form" of language based on a privileged variety of language (174), and they marked deviation from that variety as error.

Mann's legacy of assessing writing in terms of a privileged dialect was continued in the (in)famous post-Civil War period at Harvard University, which—during the presidency of Charles William Eliot—instituted entrance requirements that enforced a standard of putative linguistic correctness for prospective students, setting an example taken up at other institutions. This approach to writing assessment in the US corresponded to shifts in the national student body, when a larger and more demographically diverse population of students was entering the university—with assessments maintaining what Carmen Kynard calls "the ongoing racialized and political boundaries of who can and should have a right to higher education" (8; see e.g., Adler-Kassner and O'Neill; Elliot, *On a Scale*; Lynne; and Ruiz).

Through writing assessment, linguistic prejudices played a structural role in reinforcing social prejudices. As other institutions followed Har-

vard's example, Standardized English-centric writing assessment in the US emerged alongside (and was used to advance) anti-immigrant nativism, antiblackness, colonialism, and the eugenics movement (e.g., Elliot *On a Scale*; Hammond, "Toward"; Harms). Throughout much of the twentieth century, the journals of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) published scholarship promoting Standardized American English's superiority over other varieties, particularly African American Vernacular English (e.g., Crumpton; see also Hammond, "Toward"). As late as 1983, *College Composition and Communication* (CCC) could be found providing space for research that advanced, as its central thesis, the idea that race, IQ, and "standard" English were linked (Farrell; see, e.g., Lee and Spratley 260–261; Smitherman, "The Historical Struggle" 28–29).

NCTE and CCC have also contributed to the disciplinary infrastructure of writing assessment by taking up conversations focused on social justice and language (see Lee and Spratley; Logan, "Changing"; Wible). Importantly, many of these conversations have been initiated and led by antiracist educators of color, as well as interest and advocacy groups like the NCTE and the Conference on College Composition and Communication's (CCCC) Black Caucus and Latinx Caucus (e.g., Gilyard, *True*; Kynard; Smitherman, "The Historical Struggle"; Ruiz). Most notably, the 1974 Students' Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) resolution was designed to address questions "about the language habits of students who come from a wide variety of social, economic, and cultural backgrounds" (Committee on CCCC Language Statement 1). SRTOL—and several later documents, such as the joint NCTE and International Reading Association (IRA) *Standards for the Assessment of Reading and Writing* (see Poe and Inoue 125), and the CCCC National Language Policy and CCCC Statement on Ebonics (see Lee and Spratley)—sought to resist the standard language ideologies long structured into writing instruction and assessment. More recently, Inoue's chair's address at CCCC 2019 built on the critical work of Staci M. Perryman-Clark and Collin Lamont Craig ("Black Student") by calling attention to potential limitations of the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, urging that white scholars and instructors critically examine assumptions and engage in "an ongoing process of interrogating the paradox of judgment," as well as "how . . . languaging makes and unmakes us simultaneously" (Inoue, "How" 359).

These past infrastructural responses to linguistic injustice, and others like them, are positive moments in our common disciplinary history. Yet the need for communal justicing remains. CCCC's statements, such as its National Language Policy, have too often left room for discriminatory policies, practices, and perceptions, such as those at work in the English-only movement (Flowers). Additionally, responses that address only event-bound instances of injustice—like national controversies or new legislation—overlook the structural and substantive discrimination that surrounds race and language; they are symptoms of the larger problems posed by standard language ideologies. Language-based discrimination demands a more systematic and concerted response. Communally revising disciplinary memory (of language history, language policy, and language discrimination) can provide powerful tools for promoting critical language awareness in the field and in the classroom (see Alim; Baker-Bell; Kynard; Ruiz), drawing attention to the structural nature of injustice in writing assessment and identifying structural opportunities for responding to them. The ongoing revision of communal memory is essential because where standard language ideologies are concerned the past is, as William Faulkner puts it, not even past. Or, as Geneva Smitherman says, “the Struggle continues” (“Foreword” ix).

The Need for Policies Based on Critical Language Awareness

Policies—whether legally encoded (like the “English-only” laws historically in place in many US states), institutionally endorsed (like colleges’ use of SAT verbal scores to place students in first-year writing), or idiosyncratically adopted (like teachers forbidding the use of “I” in writing)—exert enormous power over students.⁴ Within the disciplinary infrastructure of Writing Studies, policies frame the meanings that student writers and student writing take on, complexly influencing writing assessment standards, practices, and outcomes (e.g., Adler-Kassner and O'Neill; Flowers; Jeffery; Kynard; Wible). In this way, policies can serve as vectors for standard language ideologies, narrowing the construct of writing to unfairly privilege whiteness by positioning the compositions of minoritized writers as inappropriate, inferior, or error-laden. Revising language policy requires us to move beyond critiquing policy; we must also formalize and name alternatives, for as Wardle et al. argue, “not identifying clearly what we know about how writing and language work can leave us powerless to make change in the broader world of policy, testing, legislation, and so forth” (31). The critical language

awareness for which this article advocates needs to be institutionalized, a systemic response to a systemic injustice. In this section, we describe an understanding of language that we regard as a beginning place for iteratively revising (or replacing) assessment-related policies—an understanding we consider central and essential for all composition teacher-scholars and their students. Communal justicing in Writing Studies requires developing both teachers' and students' critical language awareness to counter standard language ideologies and the structural injustices they help to manufacture.

Critical language awareness requires some knowledge of linguistics. Within the past decade, Writing Studies' attention to language appears to be increasing (e.g., Aull; Lancaster; Huckin et al.; Olinger; Young and Martinez). Nevertheless, as scholars in the field have long and regularly urged (e.g., Gere and Smith; Gilyard, *True*; Smitherman and Villanueva), there is a need for language-level study to play a more central role in writing education, shaping instruction, assessment, and—crucially—policy. To this end, we begin with four facts about language variation, drawn from the work of scholars including Anne Curzan, Bethany Davila, William Labov, Rosina Lippi-Green, Geneva Smitherman, Susan Tamasi and Lamont Antieau, and Walt Wolfram and Natalie Schilling. First, all languages change over time, as the difference between the English of *Beowulf* and today's English(es) makes clear. Second, variation is a feature of all languages—including variation according to social and regional factors. Third, these patterns of language variation carry social meanings because they index (or are taken to index) group belonging. For example, the use of *-in* rather than *-ing* can be indexed as working class. Fourth, all language varieties are equally capable of conveying meanings. Verbs in Standardized English, for instance, cannot—as verbs in other languages can—indicate that speakers are reporting on something they did not personally witness; however, Standardized English users can add words like “or so I hear” or “I assume” to convey that meaning.

Setting out these facts about language change, variation, social meaning, and communicative capability is particularly important because they do not always square with “commonsense” understandings informed by standard language ideologies. Standard language ideologies perpetuate “the belief that there is one and only one correct spoken form of the language, modelled on a single correct written form” (L. Milroy 174; Davila 184). According to this view, Standardized English is based on a written form of the language and is the one correct form of English; all other varieties of

English are incorrect (e.g., Davila; Lippi-Green; L. Milroy). The term language “conventions” conveys this assumption in many writing classrooms (e.g., Fairclough, *Critical and Language*). With its implications of “usual” and “commonly accepted,” the discourse of “conventions” justifies and reinforces standard language ideologies, recirculating the idea that Standardized English is unchanging, invariant, neutral, and correct—an idea incompatible with the four facts about language variation outlined above.

This idea is incompatible with critical language awareness—but all-too compatible with structural injustice. “Correct” and “appropriate” English has been equated, popularly and institutionally, with the variety of American English associated with and preferred by white, upper-middle class Americans. Correspondingly, other varieties of English—that is, varieties typically spoken and written by people of color and the working class—have historically been, and continue to be, treated as signs of linguistic deviance or deficiency and by extension, signs of inferiority, moral depravity, or otherness (Davila; Gilyard, *True*; Hammond, “Toward”; Inoue, *Antiracist*; Kynard; Lippi-Green; Smitherman, *Talkin*; Vieira et al.). For example, Davila’s recent research shows racialized linkages made by well-intentioned (white) writing instructors when responding to anonymized student papers: “African American students (who were always assumed to be from a low SES [socio-economic status]) were consistently linked with nonstandardness, while White middle- to upper-middle-class students were consistently linked with standardness” (196). These linkages informed instructors’ responses to student writing, such that Standardized English was often “both ‘read’ as White and deemed more acceptable than other dialects” (199).

Insofar as standard language ideologies contribute to structural injustice, communal justicing must work to actively counter them. Raising teachers’ and students’ critical language awareness is one way to do so. Our understanding of critical language awareness derives from the work of linguists Romy Clark and Roz Ivanič (see also Clark et al.) and Norman Fairclough (*Critical and Language*), who describe language as a form of social practice that shapes social structures, either maintaining or changing power relations. Clark and Ivanič underscore this point: “Language Awareness-raising which ignores issues of ideology, subject-positioning and power”—that is, *non-critical* language awareness-raising—“is in danger of complicity with social inequities maintained by language” (63). Building critical language awareness in the classroom requires supporting students in “develop[ing] not only operational and descriptive knowledge of the lin-

guistic practices of their world, but also a critical awareness of how these practices are shaped by, and shape, social relationships and relationships of power" (Clark et al. 249). Building such awareness into the disciplinary infrastructure of Writing Studies requires that the *policies* shaping instruction and assessment reserve space for critical reflection and engagement with questions of power, as they historically and presently relate to language.

We gain a sense for what such policies require when we re-read SRTOL with an attention to the affordances of critical language awareness. This indispensable document resulted from what Smitherman describes as "intense scholarly work and political struggle" and "paved the way for [the] next evolutionary stage" ("Students' Right," 22, 26). In our view, the next stage is critical language awareness for students, for while SRTOL includes *students* in the title, SRTOL is fundamentally about *teachers*. It "affirm[s] strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language" (Committee on CCCC Language Statement 3). The resolution focuses more on informing teachers about language variation than on what *students* should learn about the topic. Of course teachers should respect students' languages, but respect alone is not enough to meaningfully resist or redress structural injustice in the composition classroom or support students in doing so. A perfectly valid response to SRTOL is for teachers to take a "not wrong, just different" approach to language diversity in the classroom. Such an approach isn't *critical*: On its own, it does little to equip students to understand and navigate the unjust systems that shape how their language may be (de)valued, and does less to equip students to counter or change those systems. As Curzan advises, "it is difficult and, I think, undesirable to discuss Standard English with students as a purely theoretical issue, without talking about the politics of dialect variation" ("Teaching" 342). One example of a course that attends to critical language awareness is Perryman-Clark's Afrocentric first-year writing class, which sponsors students' critical awareness not just about "the cultural and communicative practices of African Americans," but also "how Ebonics is talked about in Composition Studies" and "how things get published in the academy" (266; see also Perryman-Clark and Craig, *Black Perspectives*). Simply put, statements like SRTOL tell teachers to respect their students' language; critical language awareness prepares students to carefully negotiate demanding respect for their own language, and "to make sound linguistic choices related to their own empowerment and not

simply the maintenance of someone else's power" (Kirkland and Jackson 147). Critical language awareness prepares students, along with teachers, to participate in communal justicing.

As we discuss in the next section, iteratively revising documents like the *Framework*—that is, documents that shape how writing educators and programs imagine and assess “success” in the writing classroom—is one important means of intervening in, and iteratively revising, the broader disciplinary infrastructure of Writing Studies. After all, developing students’ critical language awareness in the classroom requires developing the critical language awareness of new writing teachers, and explicitly requires establishing the cultivation of critical language awareness as a crucial outcome for writing education. Justicing policies in these ways, we revise the present and future of the writing classroom: Language, the center of our discipline, merits explicit and expansive attention in postsecondary writing instruction for all students, so that they understand how standardization works, the differences between descriptive and prescriptive grammars, and the power dynamics that underlie standard language ideologies. By promoting critical language awareness as a matter of policy, we help to ensure that the writing classroom is a space for teachers *and students* to participate in communal justicing.

The Need for Communally Revising Our Publications

Publications concretize and circulate both pasts and policies—shaping and documenting disciplinary preoccupations and developments (e.g., Goggin; Mueller)—so communal justicing necessarily includes the revision of documents that articulate principles and practices that shape classroom work. One of these documents is the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, which Perryman-Cark and Craig describe as “the ‘go-to’ source for WPAs who wish to do advocacy work within governmental, legislative, and institutional contexts” (“Black Student” 104). This document informs curriculum development for college writing instructors, and high school English teachers rely on it to prepare their students for college. Produced by a coalition of authors from the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), the NCTE, and the National Writing Project (NWP) in 2011, the *Framework* document was itself a project of communal revision, as authors in the coalition wrote and revised. Together, its authors took up the admirable project of responding to the *Common Core State Standards*

that had been issued during the previous year (O'Neill et al.). After surveying hundreds of instructors and drafting a first version, coalition authors gathered responses from focus groups and one another to shape their revisions.

Eschewing the limited concept of writing in the *Common Core*, authors of the *Framework* “describ[e] the rhetorical and twenty-first-century skills as well as habits of mind and experiences that are critical for college success” (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 2). They argue effectively against “standardized writing curricula or assessment instruments that emphasize formulaic writing for nonauthentic audiences” (3). They do the difficult work of delineating expectations for postsecondary writing versatile enough to respond to the many contexts of postsecondary education and specific enough to implement in each context. And they affirm habits of mind that can create and sustain student writers’ knowledge and confidence long after they have taken their last tests. The *Framework*’s “Conventions” section, however, offers both an example of the problems that emerge from the disconnect between the fields of linguistics and Writing Studies, as well as a place to begin redressing the wrongs of our field’s affirmation of standard language ideologies. Accordingly, we chose to engage in communal revision of this section, hoping that the combination of our revisions and the thinking behind them might build upon the work of the coalition, as well as serve as a model and inspiration for future communal justicing.

Title and Paragraph One

Original Conventions Section: Title and Paragraph One

Developing Knowledge of Conventions

Conventions are the formal rules and informal guidelines that define what is considered to be correct (or appropriate) and incorrect (or inappropriate) in a piece of writing. Conventions include the surface features of a text such as mechanics, spelling, and attribution of sources, as well as more global concerns such as content, tone, style, organization, and evidence. Conventions arise from a history of use and reflect the collected wisdom of the relevant readers and writers about the most effective ways of communicating in that area.

Revised Conventions Section: Title and Paragraph One

Developing Critical Language Awareness

Critical language awareness is the ability to reflect on the language expectations in a given context or of a given audience and make thoughtful, informed language choices. This awareness is based on an understanding of how language is systematic, varied, and continually changing. It also acknowledges that Standardized English has been codified as the language variety of formal, educated contexts through a standardization process that historically has privileged white middle- and upper-class speakers and writers.

Our first concern with the original version centered on the term *conventions*, explained as “the formal rules and informal guidelines that define what is considered to be correct (or appropriate) in a piece of writing” (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 9). This definition hides the identity of those who consider and determine what is correct or appropriate and suggests, in Gilyard’s words, that conventions may have “dropped from the clouds” (True, 143). Further, as Lippi-Green explains, judgements of “appropriacy” or appropriateness can “cloak subjective, culturally bound judgments of ‘correctness’” (81). Appropriacy is usually linked to language ability, meaning that a student who is not judged to use “appropriate” language will be framed as lacking communicative competence.

A few lines later in the *Framework*, “relevant readers and writers” are credited with determining “the most effective ways of communicating,” but the identities and qualifications of these “relevant” persons remain unspecified (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 9). These hidden identities make it impossible to answer what linguist Deborah Cameron describes as the necessary “searching questions about who prescribes [what is considered correct] for whom, what they prescribe, how, and for what purposes” (11). Eliding the identities of these arbiter(s) of correctness portrays conventions as a commonsense matter—a view reinforced when the original *Framework* document notes that “conventions arise from a history of use” (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 9). Here again, it’s not clear *whose* history leads to conventions, but invoking history increases their legitimacy because, as James Milroy reminds us, “*To give a history to a form was by the same token to legitimize that form*” (550, emphasis in original). As Cameron observed, conventions frequently enjoy an unquestioned authority: “Like other superficially innocuous ‘customs,’ ‘conventions’ and ‘traditions’ (dress codes included), rules of language use often contribute to a circle of exclusion and intimidation, as those who have mastered a particular practice use it in turn to intimidate others” (12). She goes on to claim, “linguistic bigotry is among the last publicly expressible prejudices left to members of the western intelligentsia” (12). The negative potential of conventions cannot be over-emphasized; mitigating that power requires both the work of individual writing instructors and the reworking of the discipline’s assessment infrastructure.

Our first revisionary move, then, was to substitute *language* for *conventions*. Remarkably, the word “language” appears nowhere in the original version of this section, thereby stripping the *Framework* of a whole set of

capacious categories, like dialect and register, the relationship between speaking and writing, the dynamics of language change, and other insights made available by language study. The absence of *language* underscores Perryman-Clark and Craig's concern that the *Framework* does not recognize "students of racially and linguistically diverse backgrounds in a way that explicitly affirms and celebrates 'register[s]' and 'dialect[s]' that students bring with them into the classroom" ("Black Student" 105).

The juxtaposition of *language* with *critical* and *awareness* connects with the "habits of mind" central to the *Framework* document. Rather than signaling that students should become knowledgeable about conventions determined by "relevant readers and writers" (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 9), the call for critical language awareness invites students and their instructors to apply the document's habits of curiosity, openness, engagement, creativity, persistence, responsibility, flexibility, and metacognition to considerations of the many dimensions of language. To emphasize the critical dimension of our revision, we eliminated the term *appropriate* because, as Cameron observes, "the language of 'appropriateness' has the effect of treating norms as facts, of obscuring their contingency and thus blunting critical responses to them" (235). By emphasizing reflection and decision making, our first paragraph emphasizes student agency, providing space for both students and instructors to participate in revisionary communal justicing.

Paragraph(s) Two/Two-Three

Original Conventions Section: Paragraph Two

Conventions facilitate reading by making material easier to comprehend and creating common expectations between [the] writer and reader. As multimodal texts become more prevalent, teachers will also need to attend to the evolving conventions of these new forms, developing appropriate conventions with new students and colleagues.

Revised Conventions Section: Paragraphs Two-Three

Language by nature changes over time and varies across speakers, writers, and communities, in both traditional and digital contexts. All speakers use one or more varieties of a language, reflecting the communities they identify with and participate in. Language is an essential part of identity, and language diversity must be part of how we understand diversity more broadly. Spoken and written language also operate differently, and standardization focuses on written language. A privileged variety of language such as Standardized English is one dialect among many, often easier to identify in writing than in speech, which has been elevated for social, political, and economic reasons; it is not inherently superior to other dialects.

Assumptions about the superiority of Standardized English are perpetuated by standard language ideologies and have participated in promoting social stratification, including racial hierarchies. Standard language ideologies position nonstandard language varieties as intellectually, socially, and/or morally inferior, which has negative social, emotional, educational, and economic effects, including inhibiting students' motivation to write.

It is true, as the authors of the original “conventions” section note, that students need to consider readers as they write and create “common expectations” (CWPA, NCTE, and NWP 9). The increased prevalence of multimodal texts also raises the “need to attend to the evolving conventions of these new forms” (9). Even so, we believe that for students to gain access to “appropriate conventions” in traditional and new media (9), these needs must be contextualized alongside critical perspectives on language development and standardization (e.g., Fairclough, *Power*; Lippi-Green; J. Milroy; L. Milroy). Specifically, students need to understand the process of

While standardization of written language carries benefits—including mutual comprehensibility across contexts and large geographical areas—it also introduces hazards and hierarchies, often privileging the language practices of those already privileged.

language standardization as iterative and ongoing. Efforts to standardize English have largely been (and largely still are) carried out by individuals (e.g., handbook authors, editors, and teachers). While standardization

of written language carries benefits—including mutual comprehensibility across contexts and large geographical areas—it also introduces hazards and hierarchies, often privileging the language practices of those already privileged. Such hierarchies have dire social consequences: Because the language one speaks is part of one's identity, disparaging a dialect also disparages the individual speaking it (see Committee on CCCC Language Statement 6; Kirkland and Jackson 143). Writing education can sponsor student learning about the power-laden process of language standardization and about how to intervene in it. As Curzan puts it, “students, like all speakers of English, have the right to know where the prescriptive rules of written Standard English come from” (“Says Who?” 870). Our revisions to this section of the *Framework* help to honor this right.

Paragraph Three/Four-Five

Original Conventions Section: Paragraph Three

Correct use of conventions is defined within specific contexts and genres. For example, a novice's grasp of a disciplinary documentation style is different from that of an advanced student's, and a writer's grasp of conventions in one context (such as a lab report for a chemistry class) does not mean a firm grasp in another (such as an analytical essay for a history course). The ability to understand, analyze, and make decisions about using conventions appropriate for the purpose, audience, and genre is important in writing.

Revised Conventions Section: Paragraphs Four-Five

All languages and language varieties have a systematic grammar in the sense that they follow *descriptive* rules. For example, some varieties of English, including African American Vernacular English, systematically employ multiple negation, and some varieties, including standardized varieties, systematically employ single negation; these are different grammatical systems, sometimes referred to as *descriptive grammar*. *Prescriptive* grammar sets out rules or conventions based on the standardized variety. The ability to distinguish between descriptive and prescriptive grammars grants writers a deeper knowledge of their own language repertoire, which is one part of affirming the validity of all language varieties.

Critical language awareness facilitates writers' abilities to make effective rhetorical choices about tone, content, organization, and evidence, as well as sentence-level features and attribution of sources for both traditional and multimodal genres. Additionally, critical language awareness empowers writers to think about whether they want to meet or challenge the expectations of discourse communities. Such an awareness also helps writers to understand the roles that judgments about language play in shaping social and racial inequalities.

The final sentence of paragraph three in the original version articulates an appealing agenda for both teaching and assessing writing, and our elimination of both *conventions* and *appropriate* encourages the development of students' abilities to make rhetorically sound choices. Similarly, we eliminate "correct use of conventions..." and explain, in paragraph four of the revised version, students' need to understand the difference between *descriptive* grammars that explain the systematic features of a given dialect and *prescriptive* grammars that dictate rules or conventions based on a standardized dialect. Students admonished to use "correct" conventions may feel that they have no power to "make decisions" about language use (CWPA, NCTE, & NWP 9). Our revision aims to move students from a constrained understanding of language as simply a matter of "correct" and "incorrect"

use to one that evokes a complicated system that includes multiple varieties, requires many choices, and has significant social implications.

The inclusion of *genre* in the original paragraph suggests one of the several dimensions of writing that requires writers to make choices. Undefined but illustrated through examples of lab reports and analytical essays, the version of “genre” invoked here appears to a collection of elements expected for a given textual form in a given setting. This conceptualization is limiting, however, because it frames genre as a product rather than a process. As Christine Tardy argues, genre encompasses not just form, but also “rhetorical strategies, procedural practices, and ideational content” that writers “draw on . . . when seeking to bend—or avoid bending—conventions” (17). In other words, genres are defined not simply by their schemata, but also by their rhetorical goals, and the ability to address rhetorical goals requires that writers are able to make choices about language. If instructors intend for students “to appropriate and manipulate [genres] for [their] own purposes,” such work invites critical consideration of how “genre conventions reflect and reinforce particular values and ideologies” (Tardy 19). A narrower understanding of genre serves to perpetuate power structures within which those perceived to be novice writers (or to lack cultural capital) are barred from innovation or rhetorical work that departs from full adherence to predefined generic products. Narrowed in this way, “genre” limits opportunities for communal revision of our writing pedagogies and practices; our recasting of the *Framework* resists such a narrowing.

Bulleted List of Pedagogical Practices

Original Conventions Section: Bulleted List of Pedagogical Practices

Teachers can help writers develop knowledge of conventions by providing opportunities and guidance for students to:

- write, read, and analyze a variety of texts from various disciplines and perspectives to:
 - investigate the logic and implications of different conventions,
 - practice different conventions and analyze expectations for and effects on different audiences,

Revised Conventions Section: Bulleted List of Pedagogical Practices

Teachers can help writers develop language awareness by providing opportunities and guidance for students to:

Write, read, analyze, and experiment with diverse language varieties and modes:

- Write, read, and analyze a variety of texts from various disciplines, modes, perspectives, and language traditions
- Experiment with the possibilities and effects of various varieties and registers on different audiences

- practice editing and proofreading one's own writing and explore the implications of editing choices,
- explore the concept of intellectual property (i.e., ownership of ideas) as it is used in different disciplines and contexts, and
- identify differences between errors and intentional variations from expected conventions;
- read and analyze print and multimodal texts composed in various styles, tones, and levels of formality;
- use resources (such as print and online writing handbooks), with guidance, to edit drafts;
- practice various approaches to the documentation and attribution of sources; and
- examine the underlying logic in commonly used citation systems (e.g., MLA and APA).

- Compare conventions across genres and registers in various forms of print and multimodal texts

Study language grammars and consider language change:

- Study the structures and assets of different varieties of English
- Develop an awareness of how language varieties come to be socially valued or devalued
- Examine the origins, validity, and usefulness of specific prescriptive rules
- Investigate aspects of language change, including connotations of words and usage practices

Reflect on language choices, practices, and identities:

- Explore and acknowledge the relationship of language and identity
- Consider how notions of correctness and appropriacy in writing are connected to broader social relations
- Practice reflecting critically on their language choices as part of the revision process
- Hone citation practices and the acknowledgment of intellectual property in different disciplines and contexts

Both the original and revised lists of pedagogical practices for teachers seek to elucidate concrete, practicable suggestions for teachers to employ in their classrooms. The *Framework's* original list, however, focuses largely on honing students' editing and proofreading practices (while offering some nods to analysis), whereas the revised version proposes that teachers encourage students' awareness of linguistic diversity and language change, while raising critical consciousness of prescriptivism. Furthermore, while there is a focus on style and register in the original list, it seems to uncritically correlate *conventions* with *best practices*—building upon the identification of “conventions” with appropriateness and correctness in preceding paragraphs of this section. In keeping with scholarship on critical language awareness and pedagogy (e.g., Baker-Bell; Clark and Ivanič; Kirkland and Jackson), our revised list highlights the important work of engaging students in a deep and recursive revision process beyond cursory editing, extending attention

to critical reflection on their language choices. While we maintain the original list's investment in audience, intellectual property, and multimodality, we expand it to acknowledge the complexity and sociopolitical nature of language. Our revised list illuminates the importance of teaching students to navigate and negotiate the many (and sometimes thorny) rhetorical contexts in which they will find themselves.

Conclusion: Sites for Communal Justicing in Writing Assessment

Structural injustices require structural interventions. Equal parts iterative, reflective, and cooperative, the work of *communal justicing* enacts what Iris Marion Young calls “a collective social project” that “involves enjoining one another to reorganize collective relationships, debating with one another how to accomplish such reorganization, and holding one another to account for what we are doing and not doing to undermine structural injustice” (153). Injustice is something Writing Studies infrastructurally inherits, irrespective of the “good” intentions and actions of individual educators (see Inoue, “How”). The process of communal justicing begins at the point where we collectively acknowledge this disciplinary inheritance, reckon with it, and revise what it means to participate in Writing Studies.

Though they often operate as a near “invisible” background (DeVoss et al. 19), disciplinary infrastructures require maintenance. As disciplinary actors, we collectively re-compose these infrastructures through our ongoing design-choices, practices, uses, and enactments—a process some scholars call “infrastructuring” (Edwards et al. 12). Justicing, as a kind of infrastructuring, is ongoing. Our composition courses can reinforce existing infrastructural arrangements—or they can serve to sponsor the critical understanding and revision of the discipline itself. This article, for instance, developed initially from conversations started in a course entitled, “The Language of Writing Assessment.” The purpose of communal justicing is not to eliminate the need to improve equity and inclusion in the field, but to make these improvement efforts so habitual within the field that it becomes difficult to imagine disciplinary participation without them.

Just as Writing Studies inherits the legacy of structural racism, we in the discipline inherit an ongoing tradition of attempts to expose injustice and to interrupt it through critical language awareness at a disciplinary level. We are honored to participate in this vibrant legacy of *justicing* work, following addresses made by CCCC conference chairs (e.g., Gilyard,

“Literacy”; Inoue, “How”; Logan, “Changing”; Powell; Royster), the development of language-conscious assessment standards (e.g., NCTE & IRA), the crafting *and iterative revision* of NCTE and CCCC position statements and resolutions (see Lee and Spratley), and concerted efforts by writing assessment scholars to establish social justice as a distinct field of inquiry (e.g., Poe et al.). This social justice-focused community is not one we initiated; it is one we link with and extend, consciously sharing in the disciplinary responsibility for communal justicing.

As Inoue has claimed, writing assessment ecologies are a complex “interconnected” assemblage of “power, parts, purposes, people, processes, products, and places” (*Antiracist* 119). Disciplinary infrastructures are no less complex, composed as they are not only of the elements above, but also of multiple sites that sponsor disciplinary group formation, identification, and conduct. Infrastructural intervention in the pasts, policies, and publications that inform writing assessment practice is necessarily an undertaking that is *communal* in scale—and the sites for such work are myriad.

- *Pasts*: Existing writing assessment historiography, for instance, remains largely color-blind (Hammond, *Composing*) and has yet to meaningfully address its racialized “rhetorical blind spots,” as Iris D. Ruiz calls them, by recovering (and learning from) the contributions of “lost or neglected” actors and events in the field’s past (12). One promising path for justicing the history of writing assessment would be to chronicle the as-yet under-documented histories of local writing assessment at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Such work would complement recent scholarship on the histories of African American rhetorical education (e.g., Logan, *Liberating*) and pedagogy and policy interventions shaped by the Black Freedom Movement (Kynard), as well as lessons from Afrocentric Writing Program Administration (Perryman-Clark & Craig, *Black Perspectives*) and writing instruction and assessment at HBCUs (e.g., Green; Jackson et al.). To paraphrase Karen Keaton Jackson and colleagues, these are histories that “belong in the discussion” regarding what writing assessment is, has been, and can be.
- *Policies*: Because assessment ecologies are shaped by broader policy infrastructures, the work of justicing requires not only attention to curricular and testing policies (e.g., Jeffery), but also to the social,

institutional, and economic “policy regimes” (Kynard 225–230) that shape broader structural inequalities. Already, assessment scholars have drawn attention to the fact that assessment ecologies can be affected by “food or housing insecurities” (Poe and Inoue 125)—just as they are affected by policies that regulate immigration, discrimination, labor conditions, and school access, accessibility, and affordability. As compositionists work to communally revise assessment-related policies at the classroom, institution, state, and national levels, it is essential that these justicing efforts bear in mind that policies influence more than outcomes for those assessed within the writing classroom: They influence, too, who can enter and remain in those classrooms—and at what cost.

- *Publications:* Even though explicit disciplinary attention to social justice seems to be increasing within Writing Studies, in-depth discussions of race, racism, and racial justice in assessment remain comparatively rare (see Hammond, *Composing* and “Making”; Inoue, “Racial Methodologies”), and are often conducted in special issues and edited collections (e.g., Inoue and Poe), without finding consistent expression in “the normative pages of mainstream composition journals,” to borrow Jackson et al.’s turn of phrase (192). Revision of field-orienting documents like the *Framework* can more centrally structure antiracism into the disciplinary infrastructure supporting writing assessment—but to support and extend this effort, assessment scholars might more regularly ask themselves, regarding *any* publication they participate in authoring: “What implications does my work have for racial (in)justice—and how can I make these implications more central, explicit, and accessible?” If assessment plays a central part in structuring injustice, then justice cannot be treated as a niche issue within the field and its publications.

From local institutional practices and policies to nationally circulated documents, the available sites for justicing writing assessment are wide-ranging and ever-evolving. Racial justicing is just one trajectory for this work; complementing it, there is need for justicing that targets other structural injustices, including ableism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, imperialism, colonialism, ageism, transphobia, xenophobia, and religious bigotry. We invite scholars in the field to join us in this revisionary work, just as we

have attempted to link to and extend the justicing work of scholars who have preceded us in the field.

In communally revisioning our writing assessment-related pasts, policies, and publications, we take distributed, dynamic action to make the disciplinary infrastructure of Writing Studies more equitable—in turn, supporting the work of making local classroom ecologies more “livable and sustainable” (Inoue, *Antiracist* 80). When we fail to think infrastructurally about our disciplinary practices and preoccupations, it becomes all too easy for us to take for granted that what we do in our classrooms is neutral. It isn’t. Whenever we seek to understand how and why, we begin to engage in justicing: We expose and inspect the discriminatory ideologies threaded through the field’s ongoing pursuit of “good writing,” more fully accounting for their consequences and casualties, so that as a community, we can compose less violent—if still imperfect—alternatives. The work of justicing requires no less.

Notes

1. This multiracial, multigenerational team of authors came together in a course entitled “The Language of Writing Assessment,” co-taught by Anne Gere and Anne Curzan at the University of Michigan in Winter 2019. All graduate student authors are in the University of Michigan’s Joint PhD Program in English & Education (or are program graduates). Our team represents teaching experience in secondary schools, community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and research universities. All the authors identify as native speakers of English.

2. Informed by scholarship on “disciplinary infrastructure” (P. Matsuda et al.), “institutional infrastructures” (DeVoss et al. 16), “information infrastructure” (Adler-Kassner and O’Neill, 185–187) and “knowledge infrastructures” (Edwards et al.), our discussion of disciplinary assessment infrastructure takes up calls within Writing Studies to grapple with the structural forces that inform assessment. We foreground the term “infrastructure” to draw attention to one of its most distinctive features, less characteristic of other forms of ecology: the way it fades into the background as “taken-for-granted, often invisible, institutional structures” (DeVoss et al. 19).

3. Like a growing number of scholars engaged in writing assessment’s social justice turn (Inoue, *Antiracist and Labor-Based*; Poe and Inoue; Poe et al.), we draw inspiration from the philosopher Iris Marion Young, whose “social connection model” stresses the need for structural injustice to be addressed through communal intervention. In focusing our attention on collective responsibility,

we do not mean to suggest such responsibility is distributed equally—though it is beyond the scope of this paper to take up this issue more comprehensively.

4. The term *policy*, for some scholars, includes not only official documents that “carry legal force or serve an official function,” but also, more generally, “written texts that outline plans for directing particular language practices toward specific political, economic, or cultural ends” (Wible 8). We have opted, instead, to reserve the term “policy” to describe formally adopted prescriptions or prohibitions (i.e., texts that are formally enforced and that carry formal force). Thus, in our terminology, the *Framework* functions principally as a publication (though it may be locally adopted or adapted to serve as policy).

Works Cited

- Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Peggy O'Neill. *Reframing Writing Assessment to Improve Teaching and Learning*. Utah State UP, 2010.
- Alim, H. Samy. “Critical Language Awareness in the United States: Revisiting Issues and Revising Pedagogies in a Resegregated Society.” *Educational Researcher*, vol. 34, no. 7, 2005, pp. 24–31.
- Aull, Laura. “Linguistic Attention in Rhetorical Genre Studies and First Year Writing.” *Composition Forum*, vol. 31, 2015, <http://compositionforum.com/issue/31/linguistic-attention.php>.
- Baker-Bell, April. “‘I Never Really Knew the History behind African American Language’: Critical Language Pedagogy in an Advanced Placement English Language Arts Class.” *Equity & Excellence in Education*, vol. 46, no. 3, 2013, pp. 355–370.
- Banks, William P., et al. “The Braid of Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity: Eighteen Assertions on Writing Assessment with Commentary.” *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity*, edited by Mya Poe et al., WAC Clearinghouse, 2018, pp. 379–425.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. 5th ed., Rowman & Littlefield, 2018.
- Cameron, Deborah. *Verbal Hygiene*. Routledge, 1995.
- Clark, Romy, et al. “Critical Language Awareness Part I: A Critical Review of Three Current Approaches to Language Awareness.” *Language and Education*, vol. 4, no. 4, 1990, pp. 249–260.
- Clark, Romy, and Roz Ivanič. “Raising Critical Awareness of Language: A Curriculum Aim for the New Millennium.” *Language Awareness*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1999, pp. 63–70.
- Committee on CCCC Language Statement. “Students’ Right to Their Own Language.” *CCC*, vol. 25, no. 3, 1974, pp. 1–32.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. *WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition*. Version 3.0, 17 July 2014, http://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/243055/_PARENT/layout_details/false.

- Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project. *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*. 2011, http://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/asset_manager/get_file/350201.
- Crumpton, Claudia E. "Speech Betterment in Alabama." *The English Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2, 1917, pp. 96–102.
- Curzan, Anne. "Says Who? Teaching and Questioning the Rules of Grammar." *PMLA*, vol. 124, no. 3, 2009, pp. 870–879.
- . "Teaching the Politics of Standard English." *Journal of English Linguistics*, vol. 30, no. 4, 2002, pp. 339–352.
- Davila, Bethany. "Indexicality and 'Standard' Edited American English: Examining the Link Between Conceptions of Standardness and Perceived Authorial Identity." *Written Communication*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2012, pp. 180–207.
- DeVoss, Dànielle Nicole, et al. "Infrastructure and Composing: The When of New-Media Writing." *CCC*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2005, pp. 14–44.
- Duffy, John. *Provocations of Virtue: Rhetoric, Ethics, and the Teaching of Writing*. Utah State University, 2019.
- Edwards, Paul N., et al. *Knowledge Infrastructures: Intellectual Frameworks and Research Challenges*. Deep Blue, 2013, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/97552>.
- Elliot, Norbert. *On a Scale: A Social History of Writing Assessment*. Peter Lang, 2005.
- . "A Theory of Ethics for Writing Assessment." *Journal of Writing Assessment*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2016, <http://www.journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=98>.
- Fairclough, Norman, editor. *Critical Language Awareness*. Longman, 1992.
- . *Language and Power*. 3rd ed., Routledge, 2015.
- Farrell, Thomas J. "IQ and Standard English." *CCC*, vol. 34, no. 4, 1983, pp. 470–484.
- Flowers, Katherine S. "Writing Studies' Concessions to the English-Only Movement: Revisiting CCC's National Language Policy and Its Reception." *CCC*, vol. 71, no. 1, 2019, pp. 31–59.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles, and Eugene Smith. *Attitudes, Language, and Change*. NCTE, 1979.
- Gilyard, Keith. "Literacy, Identity, Imagination, Flight." *CCC*, vol. 52, no. 2, 2000, 260–272.
- . *True to the Language Game: African American Discourse, Cultural Politics, and Pedagogy*. Routledge, 2011.
- Goggin, Maureen Daly. *Authoring a Discipline: Scholarly Journals and the Post-World War II Emergence of Rhetoric and Composition*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2000.
- Green, David F., Jr. "Expanding the Dialogue on Writing Assessment at HBCUs: Foundational Assessment Concepts and Legacies of Historically Black Colleges and Universities." *College English*, vol. 79, no. 2, 2016, pp. 152–173.
- Hammond, J. W. *Composing Progress in the United States: Race Science, Social Justice, and the Rhetorics of Writing Assessment, 1845–1859*. 2019. University of Michigan, PhD dissertation.
- . "Making Our Invisible Racial Agendas Visible: Race Talk in Assessing Writing, 1994–2018." *Assessing Writing*, vol. 42, 2019.

- . "Toward a Social Justice Historiography for Writing Assessment." *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity*, edited by Mya Poe et al., WAC Clearinghouse, 2018, pp. 41–70.
- Harms, Keith L. "Assessment's Word Work: Early Twentieth Century American Imperialism and the Colonial Function of the Monolingual Writing Construct." *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity*, edited by Mya Poe et al., WAC Clearinghouse, 2018, pp. 105–133.
- Huckin, Thomas, et al. "Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetoric and Composition." *CCC*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2012, pp. 107–129.
- Inoue, Asao B. *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2015.
- . "How Do We Language So People Stop Killing Each Other, or What Do We Do About White Language Supremacy?" *CCC*, vol. 71, no. 2, 2019, pp. 352–369.
- . *Labor-Based Grading Contracts: Building Equity and Inclusion in the Compassionate Writing Classroom*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2019.
- . "Racial Methodologies for Composition Studies: Reflecting on Theories of Race in Writing Assessment Research." *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies*, edited by Lee Nickoson and Mary P. Sheridan, Southern Illinois UP, 2012, pp. 125–139.
- Inoue, Asao B., and Mya Poe, editors. *Race and Writing Assessment*. Peter Lang, 2012.
- Jackson, Karen Keaton, et al. "We Belong in the Discussion: Including HBCUs in Conversations about Race and Writing." *CCC*, vol. 71, no. 2, 2019, pp. 184–214.
- Jeffery, Jill V. "Constructs of Writing Proficiency in US State and National Writing Assessments: Exploring Variability." *Assessing Writing*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 3–24.
- Kirkland, David E., and Austin Jackson. "Beyond the Silence: Instructional Approaches and Students' Attitudes." *Affirming Students' Right to Their Own Language: Bridging Language Policies and Pedagogical Practices*, edited by Jerrie Cobb Scott et al., Routledge, 2009, pp. 132–150.
- Kynard, Carmen. *Vernacular Insurrections: Race, Black Protest, and the New Century in Composition-Literacies Studies*. State University of New York Press, 2013.
- Labov, William. *Principles of Linguistic Change*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, 3 vols.
- Lancaster, Zak. "Do Academics Really Write This Way? A Corpus Investigation of the Moves and Templates in 'They Say/I Say.'" *CCC*, vol. 67, no. 3, 2016, pp. 437–464.
- Lee, Carol D., and Anika Sprately. "Working toward Social Justice in the Classroom, School, and Community." *Reading the Past, Writing the Future: A Century of American Literacy Education and the National Council of Teachers of English*, edited by Erika Lindemann, NCTE, 2010, pp. 253–280.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English with an Accent*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2012.
- Logan, Shirley Wilson. "Changing Missions, Shifting Positions, and Breaking

- Silences," *CCC*, vol. 55, no. 2, 2003, pp. 330–42.
- . *Liberating Language: Sites of Rhetorical Education in Nineteenth-Century Black America*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Lynne, Patricia. *Coming to Terms: A Theory of Writing Assessment*. Utah State UP, 2004.
- Mann, Horace. "Boston Grammar and Writing Schools." *The Common School Journal*, vol. 7, nos. 19–23, 1845, pp. 289–368.
- Matsuda, Mari, J., et al. *Words That Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech, and the First Amendment*. Westview Press, 1993.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei, et al. "Changing Currents in Second Language Writing Research: A Colloquium." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2003, pp. 151–179.
- Milroy, James. "Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization." *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2001, pp. 530–555.
- Milroy, Lesley. "Standard English and Language Ideology in Britain and the United States." *Standard English: The Widening Debate*, edited by Tony Bex and Richard J. Watts, Routledge, 1999, pp. 173–206.
- Mueller, Derek. "Grasping Rhetoric and Composition by Its Long Tail: What Graphs Can Tell Us about the Field's Changing Shape." *CCC*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2012, 195–223.
- National Council of Teachers of English and International Reading Association. *Standards for the Assessment of Reading and Writing*. Revised ed., 2009, <https://ncte.org/resources/standards/standards-for-the-assessment-of-reading-and-writing-revised-edition-2009/>.
- Olinger, Andrea R. "On the Instability of Disciplinary Style: Common and Conflicting Metaphors and Practices in Text, Talk, and Gesture." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2014, pp. 453–478.
- O'Neill, Peggy, et al. "Creating the Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing." *College English*, vol. 74, no. 6, 2012, pp. 520–524.
- Perryman-Clark, Staci. "Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures (WRA) 125—Writing: The Ethnic and Racial Experience." *Students' Right to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*, edited by Staci Perryman-Clark et al., Bedford/St Martin's, 2015, pp. 258–275.
- Perryman-Clark, Staci M., and Collin Lamont Craig. "Black Student Success Models: Institutional Profiles of Writing Programs." *Black Perspectives in Writing Program Administration: From the Margins to the Center*, edited by Staci M. Perryman-Clark and Collin Lamont Craig, NCTE, 2019, pp. 101–114.
- Poe, Mya, and John A. Cogan, Jr. "Civil Rights and Writing Assessment: Using the Disparate Impact Approach as a Fairness Methodology to Evaluate Social Impact." *Journal of Writing Assessment*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2016, <http://journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=97>.
- Poe, Mya, and Asao B. Inoue. "Toward Writing Assessment as Social Justice: An Idea Whose Time Has Come." *College English*, vol. 79, no. 2, 2016, pp. 119–126.
- Poe, Mya, et al., editors. *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advance-*

- ment of Opportunity*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2018.
- Powell, Malea. "Stories Take Place: A Performance in One Act." *CCC*, vol. 64, no. 2, 2012, pp. 383–406.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones. "When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own." *CCC*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1996, pp. 29–40.
- Ruiz, Iris, D. *Reclaiming Composition for Chicano/as and Other Ethnic Minorities: A Critical History and Pedagogy*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Smitherman, Geneva. "Foreword." *Students' Right to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*, edited by Staci Perryman-Clark et al., Bedford/St Martins, 2015, pp. v–ix.
- . "Students' Right to Their Own Language': A Retrospective." *English Journal*, vol. 84, no. 1, 1995, pp. 21–27.
- . *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. 1977. Wayne State UP, 1986.
- . "The Historical Struggle for Language Rights in CCCC." *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice*, edited by Geneva Smitherman and Victor Villanueva, Southern Illinois UP, 2003, pp. 7–39.
- Smitherman, Geneva, and Victor Villanueva, editors. *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice*. Southern Illinois UP, 2003.
- Swain, Merrill. "Languaging, Agency and Collaboration in Advanced Second Language Proficiency." *Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*, edited by Heidi Byrnes, Continuum, 2006, pp. 95–108.
- Tamasi, Susan, and Lamont Antieau. *Language and Linguistic Diversity in the US: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2015.
- Tardy, Christine. *Beyond Convention: Genre Innovation in Academic Writing*. University of Michigan Press, 2016.
- Vieira, Kate, et al. "Literacy is a Socio-historic Phenomenon with the Potential to Liberate and Oppress." *(Re)Considering What We Know: Learning Thresholds in Writing, Composition, Rhetoric, and Literacy*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State UP, 2019, pp. 36–55.
- Wardle, Elizabeth, et al. "Recognizing the Limits of Threshold Concept Theory." *(Re)Considering What We Know: Learning Thresholds in Writing, Composition, Rhetoric, and Literacy*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State UP, 2019, pp. 15–35.
- Wible, Scott. *Shaping Language Policy in the U.S.: The Role of Composition Studies*. Southern Illinois UP, 2013.
- Wolfram, Walt, and Natalie Schilling. *American English: Dialects and Variation*. 3rd ed., Wiley-Blackwell, 2016.
- Young, Iris Marion. *Responsibility for Justice*. Oxford UP, 2011.
- Young, Vershawn Ashanti, and Aja Martinez, editors. *Code-Meshing as World English: Pedagogy, Policy, Performance*. NCTE, 2011.

Anne Ruggles Gere

Anne Ruggles Gere is the Arthur F. Thurnau Professor of English and Gertrude Buck Collegiate Professor of Education at the University of Michigan, where she serves as Chair of the Joint PhD Program in English and Education. Her most recent publication is *Developing Writers in Higher Education: A Longitudinal Study*, and she is currently working on a book about Native American women who taught in boarding schools.

Anne Curzan

Anne Curzan is the Geneva Smitherman Collegiate Professor of English Language and Literature, Linguistics, and Education at the University of Michigan, where she also serves as dean of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. Her research focuses on the history of the English language, attitudes about language change, language and gender, and pedagogy.

J. W. Hammond

J. W. Hammond is a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Michigan, and researches assessment history and ethics. His work has appeared in *Assessing Writing* and the *Journal of Writing Assessment*, and the collections *(Re)Considering What We Know*, *Rhetorical Machines*, and *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity*.

Sarah Hughes

Sarah Hughes is a doctoral candidate in the Joint Program in English and Education at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, where she also teaches in the English Department Writing Program. Her research explores how women use multimodal rhetorics and discourse to navigate online gaming ecologies.

Ruth Li

Ruth Li is a PhD candidate in the Joint Program in English and Education at the University of Michigan, where she serves as a graduate student mentor and writing instructor. Her research examines first-year students' writing about literature, and her work has appeared or is forthcoming in *Assessing Writing, Computers and Composition*, and the *Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy*.

Andrew Moos

Andrew Moos is currently a doctoral student in the University of Michigan's Joint Program in English and Education. His research interests primarily focus on placement and assessment practices used to guide students to and within postsecondary composition classrooms.

Kendon Smith

Kendon Smith is a doctoral student in the Joint Program in English and Education at the University of Michigan, where he teaches courses on academic writing. His recent work has appeared in *Assessing Writing*. He is currently studying the beliefs that writing teachers hold about how readers react to language diversity.

Kathryn Van Zanen

Kathryn Van Zanen is a doctoral student in the Joint Program in English and Education at the University of Michigan. Her research centers on ethical negotiation in writing and writing instruction, particularly among raised-evangelicals writing back to their home communities on social media.

Kelly L. Wheeler

Kelly L. Wheeler is a doctoral student in the Joint Program in English and Education at the University of Michigan. Her scholarly presentations have included digital access and disability as well as how identity influences propaganda's effectiveness in online spaces. Her current scholarship focuses on mapping's rhetorical function in relation to power dynamics.

Crystal J. Zanders

Crystal J. Zanders is a doctoral student in the Joint Program in English and Education at the University of Michigan. A Rackham Merit Fellow, she is studying literacy, language, and educational inequity. As a poet-educator, she serves as a Writer-in-Residence for InsideOut Literary Arts in Detroit.