This issue of Writing Notes focuses our attention on the many networks that ASU Writing Programs teachers and students work daily to create and sustain within and without our classrooms, our offices, and our other workspaces. From the Committee on Internet Teaching’s TOWN Center; to Writing Programs’ presence at this year’s university-wide Night of the Open Door; to the first ever ASU Public Literacies Symposium; to the ASU Composition Conference 2013; to the expansion of ASU Writing Programs’ Digital Atlas; to all the conference presentations and article and book publications by our talented faculty—the people of ASU Writing Programs are consistently fostering the creation and expansion of networks both inside our program and outside it in the wider community.
Our focus on networking for this issue of Writing Notes provides an occasion for me to call attention to the ways Writing Programs teachers work to create and maintain systematic and sustaining connections with one another and with their students. The metaphor of the “network” has a number of resonances for our writing program, first because the notion that we are part of a “net” highlights the importance of our interactions with one another rather than imagining our actions are autonomous, and second because the idea of “work” names our creative efforts by the tangible outcomes they produce. The term “networking” acknowledges our actions as agents who strategically employ rhetorical practices that will create and maintain relationships with one another and with our students. The term also helps to explain some aspects of the complexities of our ways of communicating information, just one of which is this biannual program newsletter.

“Network” also describes (continued on next page)
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the means we use for reaching out to build partnerships with community groups and others outside the program as we engage with one another in discussing shared concerns and goals. Each of these ways of thinking about networks is evident in one or more of the articles in this issue, from Debbie Schwartz’s story about the Public Literacies Symposium and Ryan Shepherd’s brief report on “Night of the Open Door” to Kathleen Hicks’ discussion of the projects developed by the Committee for Innovation in Online Teaching and Heather Ackerman’s description of our Spring 2013 English 102 Studio Pilot.

“NETWORK” ALSO DESCRIBES THE MEANS WE USE FOR REACHING OUT TO BUILD PARTNERSHIPS WITH COMMUNITY GROUPS AND OTHERS OUTSIDE THE PROGRAM AS WE ENGAGE WITH ONE ANOTHER IN DISCUSSING SHARED CONCERNS AND GOALS.

In closing, I want to extend my thanks to Emily Hooper-Lewis, our Writing Programs Assistant Director who has edited Writing Notes this year, for another great issue that helps us to maintain our network of support within the English Department, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, across the University, and throughout our communities beyond.

WRITING PROGRAMS @ NIGHT OF THE OPEN DOOR 2013

By Ryan Shepherd, ASU Writing Programs Assistant Director

ASU’s Night of the Open Door (NOOD) is an annual event at which the Tempe campus is opened to the public and the university’s academic departments have the opportunity to showcase what they have to offer. The English Department set up their booths in the lobby of the Durham Languages and Literature Building for this year’s NOOD, held on Saturday, March 2. Included were booths for haiku writing, cowboy poetry, video games, and memes. Writing Programs’ theme was “Old School vs. New School Writing.” Assistant Directors Ryan Shepherd and Emily Hooper-Lewis asked participants to write based on the old/new theme. The first prompt was written on a chalkboard: “What have you done with writing in the past?” The second prompt was written on the Writing Programs Twitter feed: “What will you do with writing in the future?”

A young boy participates at Writing Programs’ Night of the Open Door ’13 booth by tweeting from the Writing Programs Twitter account (@ASU_Writing).
A Successful Start for CIOT

By Kathleen Hicks, ASU Writing Programs Lecturer

The Committee for Innovation in Online Teaching (CIOT) is pleased to report it experienced a very productive inaugural year. CIOT members for 2012-2013 were Kathleen Hicks, Lindsey G. Donhauser, Jon Drnjevic, Heather Hoyt, Ellen Johnson, and Jeanne Olson.

THANKS TO SOME SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIONS, CIOT WAS ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH SEVERAL MEASURES. FIRST, WE ARE VERY HAPPY WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHERS’ ONLINE WRITING NETWORK AND TOWN CENTER.

The committee was transformed from the former Online Education Committee under the direction of Online Education Coordinator, Kathleen Hicks, in order to widen the scope of professional development opportunities offered to teachers of Internet and hybrid Writing Programs classes. Thanks to some successful collaborations, CIOT was able to accomplish several measures.

First, we are very happy with the development of the Teachers’ Online Writing Network (TOWN) Center. We believe it is an important resource for supporting our faculty’s efforts to deliver top quality Internet-based
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education and we will continue to develop TOWN Center over the coming semesters. We invite all faculty to create and regularly update their profiles and add content to strengthen the value of this resource. CIOT plans to make TOWN Center publicly available on the Web once it is more well-developed.

Next, we were able to introduce some potential improvements to the training that will be provided for Writing Programs faculty who are new to teaching Internet and hybrid courses. After researching faculty preferences and Writing Programs’ needs, we determined faculty would benefit from more pedagogically focused training to help prepare them for teaching Internet-based courses.

Additionally, after gathering faculty opinion on the use of alternative learning management systems, CIOT has composed a set of guidelines for faculty to follow when selecting systems other than Blackboard for Internet course delivery. Watch for those guidelines next Fall. We hope to gather feedback on faculty members’ experiences with other systems to provide more information for teachers interested in exploring other options for course delivery.

Besides developing resources to support our faculty, we are now diligently working on developing an orientation module for students who enroll in Internet sections of our first-year writing courses to help improve the success rates of our students.

(continued on next page)
CIOT will be seeking faculty participation and feedback on the module in the near future to help ensure a successful launch of the project.

Finally, CIOT is most excited to introduce the Innovation Challenge, a professional development opportunity that encourages Writing Programs teachers of Internet and hybrid sections to collaborate with one another in order to improve their practices. To foster peer collaboration and classroom innovation, Writing Programs and CIOT invite faculty interested in forming peer teams of 2-4 members to implement a new teaching or technology strategy together in their Internet or hybrid classes over the course of one semester. Ideally, teams should function as support systems for implementation and evaluation of the strategy. Teams are encouraged to develop clear goals for implementation at the beginning of the semester, a plan for regular collaborative opportunities to evaluate the process, opportunities for self-reflection, and a collaborative product that documents the results/experience.

The Innovation Challenge is set to begin next Fall, and each team’s project will be celebrated at a showcase at the end of next Spring. The details, project ideas, advertisements by faculty looking for teammates, and the entry form are available on TOWN Center. We hope that all of our Writing Programs Internet and hybrid faculty will take advantage of this important opportunity to learn more about effective teaching practices, connect with colleagues, and display their hard work and talents to the university community.

CIOT is looking forward to another productive and successful year. Because we value multiple perspectives and creativity in the work we do, we are always open to new ideas and invite all Writing Programs faculty to share their ideas for improving Internet and hybrid course delivery in the Writing Programs. We extend a special invitation to anyone interested in joining CIOT next Fall. Contact Kathleen Hicks (kathleen.hicks@asu.edu) if you are interested or if you have any questions about the Innovation Challenge.

TOWN Center’s Innovation Challenge and Faculty Profiles pages.
The two-day ASU Public Literacies Symposium—held March 18-19, 2013 and spearheaded by Writing Programs Director, Dr. Shirley Rose, and Associate Professor of Community Literacy, Dr. Elenore Long—served as a brainstorming session aimed at finding ways to restructure the terms of engagement between students, teachers, administrators, community organizations, writing tutors and adult literacy center directors, Long said.

"[The symposium] helped create some momentum," Long added. "We don’t often have conversations on campus where people listen as hard as they did that day [Tuesday, the second day]. A lot of people said it had been a long time since they had spoken with such a diverse group of people, whom they didn’t know, about a topic they care about."

Funded by a portion of a $21,000 seed grant from ASU’s College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, The Department of English, Writing Programs, The Institute for Humanities Research, and community sponsor Bedford/St. Martin’s Press—what was learned at the symposium will be used to shape a grant request to the Office of Digital Humanities, part of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

“The first thing I heard today was a gap between literacy practices of schools and community,” said Carnegie Mellon Professor Linda Flower, a pioneer in the field of cognitive writing process theory. Her current work focuses on bringing strategic problem-solving approaches to writing instruction. “Maybe the theme here is trying to value community literacy practices, transforming what they know to enhance what they need to learn,” she said.

Flower, a pioneer in the field of cognitive writing process theory. Her current work focuses on bringing strategic problem-solving approaches to writing instruction. “Maybe the theme here is trying to value community literacy practices, transforming what they know to enhance what they need to learn,” she said.

“Education is the key to fighting acculturation,” explained John Kuek, a psychologist and South Sudanese immigrant living in San Diego. He spoke at the symposium about the process of public engagement in literacy. In general, the speakers defined literacy as “access.”
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“The acculturation problem is how to get a job,” Kuek explained. “For people who come here from another country illiterate, who have no education at all, they go through the problem of learning a new language. You can go to school for 15 straight years and still have a problem with English!

“If they cannot express themselves clearly, it bothers them. So, they think they cannot find a job and support their families. For us, people who have emigrated from another country, the way to change this or fight this is to educate ourselves. The best way is to educate yourself.”

Kuek’s example illustrates a confluence of rhetoric and composition and public literacy: storytelling. Through much storytelling, the symposium explored the relevance of creating partnerships around rhetoric and composition. “Storytelling is a way of passing along knowledge used in every culture we know. Stories—even post-modern ones—make sense of experiences, circumstances, events that would otherwise be incomprehensible. When people listen to one another’s stories, they can discover what they share as well as recognize important differences,” Rose said.

Cristóbal Martinez agreed, and stressed a problem: “Scholarly journals,” he said, “do not tend to accept research based on addressing problems of literacy through storytelling.” Reared in New Mexico’s Española Valley Pueblo de Alcalde, Martinez is a doctoral student in ASU’s School of Transformation’s Center for Indian Education.

Martinez said, “For many cultures, storytelling is an way of archiving, learning, sharing experiential learning. They are a way of theory-building, embodying ways of learning. How do we learn to value storytelling in situations where the environment is empirically-based knowledge?”

The symposium had one of its intended effects on Ben Ambler, an ASU Writing Programs TA. He said of Linda Flower’s talk that he took away many “theories and skills for democratizing the intellectual enterprises of the university.”

Critical incidents theory is valuable for studying public literacies because it demands looking at the moments where researchers can see the problem at work, why something is a problem and at the multiple pressures on the people involved, Goldblatt said.

“The argument is that writing is both done very much alone and done socially. In composition, there tends to be an emphasis on the social, and in literature there tends to be an emphasis on the individual or the lone writer. I don’t think either one of those pictures is really adequate to show the range of possible writing experiences. What is ‘important’ about writing comes from your experience of writing,” Goldblatt said.
Teaching Awards @ ASU Composition Conference 2013

By Peter Wegner, ASU Writing Programs Instructor

On March 23, a large group of teachers converged on the English Department at the Arizona State University Tempe Campus. The recent Composition Conference at ASU was a collegial way for everyone in Writing Programs to get together. In addition to the numerous talks and panels, the conference offered a way for our many teachers to meet and get to know one another better. The event highlighted the dedication of teachers in Writing Programs to expanding their knowledge and to networking with each other. Everyone was in good company!

Among the attendees were hardworking teachers who labor every day to advance the writing skills of students at Arizona State University and other institutions. Fortunately, some of these efforts were rewarded at the conference. The Teaching Awards Committee recognized the steadfast
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A Year in the Life of ViTA

By Emily Hooper-Lewis, ASU Writing Programs Assistant Director

Writing Programs began the “Visualizing Teaching in Action” (ViTA) Project at the start of AY ’12 – ’13. The Writing Programs administrative team’s goal for the first year of ViTA was to document the daily teaching and learning environments and activities of Writing Programs faculty and their students in the context of Writing Programs courses. We wanted to make visible the work we and our students do every day—make it visible to other teachers at ASU and at other institutions, to our students, and to the publics who have an interest in the outcomes of our work. We also wanted to celebrate all the good work that Writing Programs faculty and students do day in and day out.

Now, at the end of the Spring ’13 semester, we have documented—through photographs, co-authored captions by instructors and assistant directors Ryan Shepherd and Emily Hooper–Lewis, and student commentary—the diverse classroom experiences of almost 10% of the entire ASU Writing Programs faculty. For a detailed description of the intricacies of the project, please refer back to Ryan Shepherd’s article about ViTA published in the Fall ’13 issue of Writing Notes. You can find photo galleries of every classroom we visited at the official ViTA blog, https://asuwp.wordpress.com/

Finally, we’d like to thank the following Writing Programs faculty for graciously inviting us into their classrooms and participating in the ViTA Project’s inaugural year: Brent Chappelow, John Henry Adams, Katherine Daily, Kacie Kiser, Cornelia Wells, Bob Haynes, Youngwha Lee, Paulette Zillmer, Dana Tait, Katherine Heenan, Samantha Ruckman, Lupco Spasovski, Christy Skeen, Steven Hopkins, Dawn Opel, Karen Dwyer, and Christine Gillette.
dedication of two outstanding Instructors from Writing Programs. Jan Kelly and Don Ownsby received awards for their continuing creativity and innovative methodology in the classroom. Both Instructors received the 2013 Instructor Teaching Awards for their submissions and gave short talks on their submissions at the end of the conference.

Jan Kelly received the award for her submission entitled, “Second Semester Stretch (ENG 101) Writing assignment: The Profile Essay.” Kelly’s assignment asks students to interview someone in a career they would like to be in. What makes her assignment enlightening for students is that it involves a class visit to a campus location to practice field observation and to engage students in experiential learning. In the past Jan Kelly has taken her students for a tour of NASA’s Mars Space Flight Facility. This type of assignment encourages students to network outside of the communities they know.

Don Ownsby received the award for his submission entitled, “Business Correspondence Assignment for English 302.” Ownsby’s assignment asks students to focus on two particular types of correspondence in Business Writing: positive and negative messages. The English 302 assignment offers Ownsby’s students a way to understand some of the more difficult concepts in writing. Particularly, his assignment has students analyze negative messages in terms of rhetorical components. Additionally, his assignment was clear and easy-to-follow, something many students would appreciate!

Both recipients of the 2013 Instructor Teaching Awards received signed certificates, gift baskets, and $150 awards in recognition of their assignments. Not only were they recognized for their submissions, but also for their years of service in teaching at ASU. Jan Kelly and Don Ownsby are representative of the people who attended the 2013 Composition Conference at ASU: caring individuals who want to see all their students become better writers and thinkers.
Adapting the English 102 Studio Pilot

By Heather Ackerman, ASU Writing Program FA

In Fall 2012 students had the opportunity to take ENG 101 in a studio format that combined face-to-face instruction, online assignments, and optional team-taught workshops. This class format boasted several advantages for instructors and students alike: instructors were able to collaborate on lesson plans and share their insights for various projects while students could attend bonus workshops whenever it suited their needs and their schedules. Unfortunately, students were not attending the workshops in the Fall (see “Braving the English 101 Studio Pilot” by Tina Santana and Robert LaBarge from Fall 2012’s issue of Writing Notes).

The top priority, therefore, in planning the Spring 2012 English 102 studio pilot was to make the workshops more appealing and constructive so that more students might take advantage of those additional lessons.
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EXPANDING THE ASU WRITING PROGRAMS DIGITAL ATLAS

By Emily Hooper-Lewis, ASU Writing Programs Assistant Director

In my capacity as an assistant director for Writing Programs during this past year, one of my projects has been to expand on a resource started last year by Dan Bommarito (ASU Writing Programs Assistant Director, AY ’11-’12)—that is, the ASU Writing Programs Digital Atlas. So, what is the purpose of the Digital Atlas? It started with a pressing need. There has been and continues to be a demonstrated need from the Writing Programs admin team to have quick, easy, routine access to very specific pieces of data regarding the Programs’ past, present, and future. An organizational framework, in the form of something akin to a digital binder with tabs, was created to house all this data. Here are the framework’s major categories thus far: Mission and Values Statements; Courses, Grades, and Enrollments; Teaching Faculty and Employment Conditions; Program Assessments and Reports; Schedules of Program Emails; Committees, Initiatives, and Partners; and Budgets.

Much of my work with the Atlas over this past year has involved identifying gaps—in collaboration with Prof. Rose—in initial framework, then revising and expanding the framework to fill in such gaps. The majority of my work on the Atlas has been scanning paper files (and naming and organizing the resulting PDFs) generated in the course of the last 20+ years of ASU Writing Programs’ history.

(continued on page after next)
We tried several tactics in order to attract more students to our optional sessions. We provided students with a battery of “yes” or “no” questions that would help them determine whether the optional workshop would be useful to them. We based each session on material that was closely linked to the assignments and essential collegiate skills. We added more seminar-style activities so that students would be able to discuss their paper topics and process paragraphs for their own essays, and thereby directly benefit from their workshop participation. We tempted them with extra credit, candy, and our direct input on their projects. In short, we tried inducements that spoke to our students’ educational, professional, and personal interests.

Ironically, we teachers of rhetoric could not find a way to persuade students to attend our workshops. During the course of the Spring 2013 semester attendance averaged about three students per workshop, and several sessions were canceled because no students managed to show up. Such scant student involvement severely limited what we could do in the workshops: discussions were often uneven and one-sided, group activities like peer review were sometimes impossible, and even the streamlined PowerPoint presentations hit a few snags when there were not enough students in the room to offer answers to our Socratic questions.

While it was encouraging to see a few dedicated students who committed to coming to every workshop and developed firm footing in the class, it was disheartening to see our best efforts and intentions largely going to waste.

But there are some silver linings to consider with this misfire: one of the major benefits from this studio set-up is that it has allowed a good sample group for research. Tina Santana, doctoral student in Rhetoric, Composition, and Linguistics has been issuing surveys to students and monitoring classes in order to reach conclusions about how class size correlates to student satisfaction and participation. Another doctoral student in R/C/L, Rebecca Robinson, is tracking how the five different sections of the studio pilot responded to her innovative disciplinary argument assignment. In addition to these focused research projects, all of the studio instructors—Robert LaBarge, Tina Santana, Kent Linthicum, Bill Martin, and Heather Ackerman—have been keeping reflective journals that might be used for future research or pedagogical planning. With any luck, these studies will help us determine how to perfect our class designs, our methods of instruction, and our understanding of student needs.

Adapting the English 102 Studio Pilot
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The amount of data generated each and every year (let alone across 20+ years) by one, if not the largest writing program in the country was, to me, astonishing—and to be quite honest, slightly bewildering. I had no idea that our Program generates the kinds of documents I found and worked with this year. And as I went deeper into the archives, if you will, I often emerged quite puzzled by the different types of data we produce and keep, what we choose to keep, and why we choose to keep the things we do.

Without space to share a comprehensive list of documents and data we have, here is just a smidgen of what ASU Writing Programs has regularly generated and saved in its paper files for each semester (Fall, Spring, Summer) of every year for more than 20 years:

- Enrollment Figures that delineate by course the number of individual sections, the number of students, and also various totals as needed;
- Course Inquiries that include information such as line numbers, credit hours, meet-times, days, class caps, numbers of students registered, etc.;
- Class Status Reports, generated via running a report in the Registrar’s system, for each and every Writing Program class taught that semester;
- Alphabetized lists of faculty Office Hours & Teaching Schedules;
- Teaching Schedule Matrices that include information such as course line numbers, class times, and class days for every individual Writing Programs teacher working that semester, all broken out by rank;
- And once a year every year, a new ASU Writing Programs “Guide to Teaching First-Year Composition.”

Of course, this list doesn’t even begin to touch on any of the Writing Programs photographs and videos we have, or any of the copious materials generated by various Writing Programs committees, task forces, curriculum initiatives, pilots, and other special projects.

For some of the paper files I’ve scanned, no digital files have ever existed previously—that is, many years’ worth of the Writing Programs paper files include handwritten documents, typed pages (Not word processed. Remember typewriters? Those were the days!), photocopied pages, and mimeographed or spirit duplicated sheets. Other paper files perhaps were digital files at one point in time, but those digital bits have either been lost along the way or our current digital technology has so far outstripped the technology with which the initial digital files were created that those original digital files can no longer be accessed.
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because there hasn’t always been a consistent pattern for naming the files, nor a single, specially designated place in which to save them, it was determined that, at best, finding even handfuls of such digital files would have been very difficult. And finding all of them? It was determined that such a thing would have been next to impossible. So, I scanned and scanned.

And yes, all the scanning and naming and organizing was time-consuming. But it gave me brief and fascinating glimpse into the past life of our writing program and its people. And I only went back to 1990! But I came across the neatest little finds that someone, or more probably many people, left years ago without ever thinking anyone might look at these papers again: So many Post-It notes, having long ago lost their stickiness, that tell miniature tales of a scheduling challenge or something to remember about a particular course enrollment; page after connected page printed from dot-matrix printers, still with the neatly hole-punched edges attached to both sides, edges that you can tear off if you want, only someone chose not to.

There are so many possible stories to be mined of individual teachers, and of classes, and of the program as a whole—stories just waiting to be discovered and brought to light, not just by the Writing Programs admin team but also by future researchers who hopefully someday are able to dive into the Atlas, spurred on by persistent questions about the day-to-day paper strewn trail of this writing program’s history. Or perhaps a graduate student interested in writing program administration will form research questions that lead to a dissertation in WPA studies based on all this newly available data—all of it now housed inside what is becoming a richer resource by the year, the ASU Writing Programs Digital Atlas.
As mentioned earlier in Debra Schwartz’s article, 2013 was the inaugural year of the ASU Public Literacies Symposium. This two day event brought noted community literacy scholars Eli Goldblatt, Tiffany Rousculp, and Linda Flower to ASU to speak not only about their work in community literacy projects, but also to engage with ASU students, faculty, and staff, as well as the wider Phoenix community, to foster a conversation around literacy practices, opportunities, and challenges for literacy efforts in our community. Specifically, the conversation turned on the second day to the experiences of South Sudanese families living in Phoenix, including a talk by San Diego psychologist and South Sudanese community advocate John Kuek.

Writing Programs TA and doctoral student in Rhetoric, Composition, and Linguistics, Dawn Opel, who took Associate Professor Ellie Long’s Community Literacy course this semester, brought her English 102 students to participate in the Symposium. Their class involvement was grounded in the method of Krista Ratcliffe’s “rhetorical listening.” Opel asked her students to attend a session with a five-question “listening guide” in hand to identify visual and oral cues as to what ideas particularly resonated with the Symposium community. After the Symposium, Opel’s English 102 students drafted a blog post that reflected on these listening practices. These student reflections offered many insights into the Symposium experience and community literacy more generally. The content of many of the talks was theoretical and abstract, but listening rhetorically enabled all participants to engage with the Symposium in ways that made everyone feel engaged and productive.

Highlights from their blog post include:

On Eli Goldblatt’s talk:
“People are discovering how universities can interact with communities through projects designed to defeat illiteracy [through] Goldblatt’s stories about his own projects he has started and done over the years, what he found worked, what troubles he went through and what he learned. The audience heard ideas of what the definition of community is and what they think can be done to promote projects like Tree House Books” (David Madsen, sophomore Political Science major).

On Tiffany Rousculp’s talk:
“… [The] Community Writing Center in Salt Lake City is using a new way of coaching to help increase the ability and effectiveness of the writers. This center introduces a new way to effectively write that embraces mistakes. They coach the writers in how to turn their mistakes into tools to further enhance their pieces” (Brian Reilly, freshman Business major).

On Linda Flower’s talk:
“People listened to all that the speaker had to say up until the very end. I could see that people, with the exception of a few, were very dialed in on every word of the presentation. People seemed to value the power that the words held in the presentation and how the writing of a few students could make...”
such a strong point. The writing served the purpose of vocalizing a problem, specifically the conflicts for ‘independent students’ in college” (Tristan Marshall, freshman Engineering major). Also regarding Linda Flower: “Her style of speech had similarities to the current Writing Project 2 I am doing, taking something complicated and making it simple. Putting out what the problem is, what the theories are, and potential solutions” (Heather Miller, junior Physics major).

On John Kuek’s talk: “Yes, people seemed to have met new people at the workshop as I am speaking to someone I have just met. Also South Sudanese people came into the room creating a more diversified scene, and also [I am] seeing the people first hand that contribute to the project” (Vid Micevic, sophomore Civil Engineering major).

The ASU Public Literacies Symposium involved members of the ASU community, the scholarly community, and the Phoenix metropolitan area community, all finding a space either to listen or speak. Undergraduate students’ involvement and reflection added to the richness of this dialogue, both at the Symposium itself and as we as a diverse community continue to find ways of improving literacy efforts locally in Phoenix.
Book Review: Agency in the Age of Peer Production

By Katherine Daily, ASU Writing Programs TA

Those of us in Professor Shirley Rose’s Spring 2013 ENG 652 course on Writing Program Studies were assigned Agency in the Age of Peer Production at the start of the semester. However, I recommend this book for any individual associated with ASU Writing Programs, because it gives the reader an insider’s view into the dynamics of how one particular writing program is adapting to new technologies that affect communication and program decisions.

Scholars and writing instructors Quentin D. Vieregge, Kyle D. Stedman, Taylor Joy Mitchell and Joseph M. Moxley present a qualitative research study focused on tracing the attempts of The University of South Florida’s writing program to develop a collaborative and shared common curriculum using peer production tools: new technologies that can include social software and media, web applications, wikis, blogs and video-sharing platforms among others.

Vieregge, et al. write, “Instead of feeling alone, isolated behind closed classroom doors […] today’s educators can collaborate on documents, pedagogies, and assessments in unprecedented ways with peer-production technologies” (2). Indeed, there is the opportunity for writing instructors to have a more collaborative teaching experience thanks to technologies many of us already use in our classrooms: Google Drive, Blackboard, Schoology, blogs and wikis, and more. The study examines the “teacherly agency” that occurs when we band together “to create ideas and practices that are better than the sum of what any teacher could have developed alone” (2).

Specifically, the authors explore the effects that peer production tools have on the power relations among teachers, students, and administrators in an English department or writing program. In addition, they examine the possible reasons why these new technologies have the potential for success or failure, the notion of face-to-face interactions and collaboration when used in conjunction with these tools, and the values we hold when faced with trying out something new (e.g., peer production technologies). The results of the study suggest that agency is exercised both individually and collectively when using peer production tools—and there is very real capacity for these kinds of tools to further a shared goal or vision for other university writing programs.

Agency in the Age of Peer Production fits in nicely with the theme of this edition of Writing Notes: writing networks. Peer production tools have tremendous potential to enhance the networks within our own Writing Programs. The final
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chapter in the text proves to be a practical one for any instructor or administrator in a writing program by answering the question, What can other programs learn from this study?, and by making an explicit link to how peer production tools affect the networks that occur in a writing program:

…the ability to effect change within an institutional educational context in the twenty-first century depends largely on an understanding of how individuals interact with one another (both in face-to-face and online contexts) and define themselves and their community. [...] Agency is not necessarily bounded exclusively by one’s ability to use technologies, but by one’s network of online and face-to-face relationships. (143)

In other words, having access to peer production tools and new technologies is an exciting possibility for a writing program. However, establishing supportive, collaborative relationships with others in our network (e.g., fellow teachers, mentors, administrators) is a prerequisite for how effectively these tools can be used in our favor.

Overall, Vieregge, et al. believe that in the 21st century, “agency depends largely on an understanding of how individuals interact with each other and define themselves and their community” (143), regardless of the technologies that are available. The authors of Agency in the Age of Peer Production present a study that documents the messiness of one particular network (The University of South Florida’s writing program), and focuses on this network’s individual members as they work to adapt to today’s technologies and discover the opportunities that peer production tools have for collaboration, decision-making and agency within a writing program.

In 2012, Kim Donehower, Charlotte Hogg, and Eileen Schell published *Reclaiming the Rural: Essays on Literacy, Rhetoric, and Pedagogy*, a co-edited collection of essays that discuss literacy, rhetoric, and pedagogy in rural areas including the United States, Canada, and Mexico. *Reclaiming the Rural* is the second book the three have written together, their first being *Rural Literacies* (2007) in which their goal was to engage those in the field of rhetoric and composition in conversations regarding rural literacies, as well as to share strategies with their readers that would help them to better understand such rural literacies and work for sustainability in rural areas. *Reclaiming the Rural* is, in many ways, a continuation of this work but with more perspectives and a broader focus. As Donehower et al. state in the preface to *Reclaiming the Rural*, their desire was “to expand [their] initial research to include a broader set of sites, populations, perspectives, and methodologies,” which is precisely what is accomplished in their book.

Divided into three distinct sections—Land Economies and Rhetorics, Histories, and Pedagogies—the book guides readers easily through the different perspectives offered throughout the book. The first section consists of three essays, all of which address issues of literacy and/or rhetorics pertaining to rural areas in the physical and geographical sense. For instance, one essay in this section explores in-depth the rhetorics of water disputes in the western part of the United States while drawing upon an alternative understanding of ethos as “a habitual gathering place.” The second section, Histories, helps readers to “uncover rural histories in ways that are not too celebratory or preservationist but reflect the material, social, and economic realities of rural life” (10). Essays in this section focus specifically on issues pertaining to historical and critical literacies in rural areas such as northern New Mexico, stereotypes that characterize rural women’s labor, and literacies of what have often been viewed as “rural” organizations, such as 4-H. The third and final section (and perhaps the most thought-provoking for those who are interested in teaching), contains essays devoted to pedagogy. As Donehower et al. indicate in their introduction, this section “explores both challenges and successes as educators negotiate with rural populations instead of deciding for them” (11). The
essays in this final section are diverse, covering topics such as developing strategies for nurturing young rural activists, ways to prepare students for rural citizenship and advocacy, and fostering mutual identification among urban, suburban, and rural students. In addition, Sara Webb-Sunderhaus’ essay examines how literacy is marketed to rural college students, while Jacqueline Edmondson and Thomas Butler provide an analysis of the critical literacy development of K-12 teachers. As a result, readers are provided with a full range of perspectives spanning both pre- and post-secondary education.

Throughout their book, Donehower et al. make a well-established argument for the need (and value) in reclaiming the rural for both public and academic purposes. But more importantly, as we witness the public turn in rhetoric and composition as it becomes more recognized in the field, Reclaiming the Rural is a valuable collection that will help to facilitate and aid in this transition as rhetorical research shifts to subjects that include ordinary citizens and the public life that exists outside of the academy.
As composition teachers, many of us see our classrooms as more than places where students learn important critical thinking and writing skills to use in an academic setting. Indeed, we see our classrooms as sites of opportunity for students to engage with social issues and utilize these tools to enact change. At the same time, we teachers often struggle with how best to achieve these aims: not only is translating into practice ideas about the role of student writing in social justice quite challenging; we are wary of imposing our own views on students in our efforts to spark their critical insights. In addition, the temporal and physical confines of a 16-week semester and a university classroom can make engaging in meaningful social justice work difficult.

 texts of consequence: composing social activism for the classroom and the community (Cresskill: Hampton Press, 2012), edited by Christopher Wilkey and Nicholas Mauriello, offers us accounts of ways that composition courses can work to foster social awareness in students. This collection is centered around three major themes: the history of the interplay between composition studies and social activism; the role of writing programs in building curricula that encourage social justice work and active citizenship by students; and how community literacy projects and composition courses can create authentic opportunities to get out of the classroom and into the community to enact social change.

Focused on “the prospects of developing a direct link between the teaching of writing and the public sphere,” the chapters in this book advocate a shift from thinking in classrooms to doing in communities. The first section includes an examination of the burgeoning of composition courses as a means for social action in the 1960s, as well as an exploration of how teachers can draw on this history to encourage students to see writing as an opportunity to “reimagine their place” in an unjust world. The next section begins with two chapters about Writing Across the Curriculum: one chapter that re-envisions Writing Across the Curriculum as “Writing Across Communities,” a concept that incorporates a focus on local as well as
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global issues, and a second about a writing program initiative that puts this notion into practice. Also in this section is a chapter about how writing program administrators and instructors can move from a technocratic model of writing program curricula and assessment towards an approach that creates space for students and faculty to develop and exercise agencies, identities, and actions that differ from those recognized by traditional models. The final section of the book offers examples of how community literacy projects and composition courses can provide students real world experience with social justice work, and how such projects, when constructed carefully and collaboratively, can have meaningful, long-lasting consequences. The chapters in this section include discussions of how particular types of compositions, such as new media compositions and “hybrid literacy tactics” like “zines,” offer students important opportunities for realizing change. This section also offers insight into how to craft projects that both do real justice to the communities they seek to benefit and avoid the pitfalls frequently associated with university-community partnerships.

Although the book is concerned explicitly with “linking literacy education to social change,” writing teachers with a wide variety of interests will find it informative, engaging and useful. Its broad coverage of issues ranging from the history of composition studies, to concrete curricula reforms, to real-world models of community literacy projects at work, make Texts of Consequence a thought-provoking read with practical applications for all of us.

ANA BOCA

Ana Boca is a first-year graduate student in the Master of Fine Arts program (concentrating in poetry) at Arizona State University. She has a Bachelor of Arts in Creative Writing focusing in poetry from Arizona State University. Ana is currently an English T.A. for Writing Programs and the English Department.*

*From the Editor: We regret that Ana’s bio did not appear in the Fall 2012 issue of Writing Notes along with the bios of her fellow “New TA” colleagues. We rectify that accidental omission here. Please join us in officially welcoming Ana as part of the Writing Programs faculty and in thanking her for her year of service to the Program and our students.
Andrea Alden, Jeanne Olson, and Jackie Wheeler presented papers on March 15, 2013 at the Conference on College Composition and Communication in Las Vegas, Nevada. Their session was titled "Institutionalizing Innovation: Collaboration, Class Size, and Conflict."

Shavawn M. Berry and Julianne White were awarded Teaching Fellowships in Applied Ethics for 2012-2013 in December of 2012, by the Lincoln Center of Applied Ethics at Arizona State University. The fellowship includes a $4,000 stipend for each of them to create a new ethics-based curriculum for the business writing courses they teach. Shavawn M. Berry’s poem, Ephemera, was published in the anthology, The Cancer Poetry Project 2 in April 2013.

Dan Bommarito wrote "New Directions in Collaborative L2 Writing: A Critical Review," which was selected for this year’s Outstanding Paper on Second Language Writing Award. He is also the recipient of the Wilfred A. Ferrell Memorial Fellowship award for 2013-2014.

Elizabeth Ferzst was asked by Paul Anderson, author of Technical Communication: A Reader-centered Approach, to edit the 8th edition (book we use for 301), which she did in December. She also co-chaired and presented at a panel on the 400th anniversary of the birth of writer Anne Bradstreet at the Society of Early Americanists biennial conference in Savannah in March. She is co-editing a special issue on Anne Bradstreet studies for the Journal of Women’s Studies (Claremont Grad. School). Elizabeth also published the third book in her YA trilogy on Anne Bradstreet, The Fifth Monarchy, available at Amazon.com. Additionally, she will be attending the AP Reading for the Exam in English Literature in Louisville KY in June. Finally, Elizabeth taught a total of ten sections of composition classes this year (101, 102, 301).

Valerie Finn publishing as Valerie Bandura, has a collection of poems, Freak Show, is forthcoming from Black Lawrence Press/Dzanc Books, May 2013. She also has received a Pushcart nomination from Ploughshares for the poem "Two Weeks," published in the journal’s winter 2012-2013 issue and edited by John Skoyles and Ladette Randolph.

Kudos
(continued from previous page)

Teaching” alongside ASU’s own Ersula Ore and NCTE president Keith Gilyard. Tina will be co-authoring a chapter with Shirley Rose to be included in an edited collection focused on writing studio innovations.

Robert Santana-LaBarge successfully persuaded Linguistic great Massimo Piatelli-Palmarini to join Elly Van Gelderen and Carrie Gillon on his doctoral committee. He also recently published his second book review for the online community, Linguist List.

Kerri Linden Slatus and Jennifer Russum co-chaired the Southwest English Symposium (SWES) in February. They along with a wonderful SWES committee revitalized the conference in a big way, bringing in many fine scholars to ASU. A rousing success!

Bruce Matsunaga and Brent Chappelow, receive kudos for going above and beyond the call of duty with technical expertise and assistance during SWES.

Keith Miller served as respondent to a Featured Session of CCCC in March 2013 in Las Vegas. The session featured Yvette Johnson and focused on the research of her undergraduate research at ASU, research that resulted in a film (titled Booker’s Place) that was screened at the Tribeca Film Festival and lauded by the NY TIMES, LA TIMES, and Roger Ebert. Miller’s book, Martin Luther King’s Biblical Epic: His Great, Final Speech (2011), was recently reviewed favorably in both Rhetoric Society Quarterly and Rhetoric and Public Affairs. His essay “Charging Treason While Committing Treason: Patricia Roberts-Miller’s Cunning Projection as a Framework for Understanding Barack Obama’s Identity Critics” will be published shortly in the proceedings volume of the Rhetoric Society of America conference of 2012. His essay/book review of several books about Martin Luther King’s rhetoric appeared in the Spring 2013 issue of Rhetoric and Public Affairs. In July 2013, he will teach a summer course called “The Civil Rights Movement in the U.S.” at Chonbuk National University in Jeongsu, South Korea. He accepted an invitation to speak at the University of Alabama, Birmingham, in September on the 50th anniversary of the infamous church bombing there in 1963.

Rebecca Robinson presented papers at 3 conferences: CCCC (It was her first time presenting at CCCC, and she was awarded a GPSA travel grant for it.), the 18th Southwest English Symposium, and the ASU Composition Conference.

Cornelia "Corri" Wells received this year's CLAS Outstanding Lecturer Award. She will be recognized at the CLAS Convocations on May 10, 2013. Dr. Wells also served this year as the Prison Education Awareness Club Faculty Advisor (PEAC is pronounced like peace), overseeing the highly inspirational second annual Prison Education Awareness Conference held March 29th in the University Club. Speakers included the internationally acclaimed Reuters journalist Alan Elsner (author of Gates of Injustice: The Crisis in America's Prisons), Michelle Ribeiro (Acting Education Director at the Penitentiary of New Mexico), and Sue Kenney (a Trustee for FirstFriends.org, a group, a group which seeks to end...
Jon Drnjevic has now been at ASU for 15 years. He was with ASU Libraries and taught as a Faculty Associate until 2004. He has been full-time in English as an Instructor since then.

Cecilia Granillo has worked as a Faculty Associate for one year and has so enjoyed it that she has decided to return to school to pursue doctoral studies in Rhetoric and Composition. After attending the National Council of Teachers “Ignite” conference, her passion was awakened and she realized that teaching is an ever-evolving profession, and that the more she has learns, the better teacher she will be for students. Go, Cecilia!

Egyirba High will reach her 10 years at ASU in August 2013. She began as a Faculty Associate in 2003. She became an Instructor in 2005.

Robert and Tina Santana-LaBarge celebrate their wedding anniversary on the 12th of every month. So far (in April) they have shared four anniversaries!

Above: Alissa (left) and Sarah (right), first-year composition students, practice their interview skills in preparation for interviews they’ll be conducting to collect primary research for their community advocacy projects in the ENG 102 class of Steven Hopkins, ASU Writing Programs TA. Steven uses http://www.e.ggtimer.com, projected on the classroom’s large screen, to help the students keep track of time. Photo courtesy of The ViTA Project.

Right: ENG 102 (hybrid) students read and think about the day’s class activity as Katherine Heenan, ASU Writing Programs Lecturer, explains it for the first time. Note that each workspace in this Hassayampa Academic Village classroom is outfitted with a Macintosh laptop, which students may choose to use if they wish. Photo courtesy of The ViTA Project.
THANKS FOR A GREAT SPRING SEMESTER!

Call for Submissions: Writing Notes Fall ’13

- Writing Notes again seeks contributors for our next issue. We invite book reviews of approximately 500 words on pedagogical texts of interest to Writing Programs faculty and students. We ask also for 150-word submissions on “Classroom Strategies that Work,” a continuing segment devoted to sharing the practices we employ in our own classrooms with other Writing Programs teachers. And don’t forget to submit your Kudos and Milestones during the next semester! Email submissions to writingprogramsasu@gmail.com.

- Have other article submissions or suggestions? Please share them with us at writingprogramsasu@gmail.com.

- Want to discuss what you’ve read in this issue? Visit any of our media outlets—including our Facebook page (http://www.facebook.com/ASUWritingPrograms), our Twitter feed (@ASU_Writing; https://twitter.com/ASU_Writing), and the Writing Programs Blackboard site—to provide your feedback and commentary.

Writing Programs
Arizona State University
Department of English
Box 870302
Tempe, AZ 85287-0302