Writing & Power: Positions and Policies for Social Change

Writing & Power: Position and Policies for Social Change is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council in partnership with Canadian Heritage. Rédaction et Pouvoir: Positions et Politiques pour le Changement Social est financé par le Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines en partenariat avec Patrimoine Canadien.

Prepared by

Dr. Sara Humphreys, Associate Teaching Faculty, University of Victoria (PI)

Dr. Loren Gaudet, Assistant Teaching Professor, University of Victoria (CI)

Dr. Jason Collins, Assistant Teaching Professor, University of Victoria (CI)

Natalie Boldt (Writing Centre Expert and Research Assistant)

With special thanks to Kara Hagedorn (Research Assistant) and Dr. Erin Kelly, Associate Professor (English) and Director of the Academic and Technical Writing Program, University of Victoria (Collaborator)

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 4
Background: The Issue 4
Objectives 4
Results & Key Messages 5
Methodology (search methods, selection criteria, data collection and analysis) 5
Self-Location Statements 6
BACKGROUND: THE ISSUE 7
OBJECTIVES 8
METHODS (SEARCH METHODS, SELECTION CRITERIA, DATA COLLECTION, AND ANALYSIS) 10
RESULTS 13
Perspectives on Postsecondary Writing and Citational Justice 14
Workshop Synthesis 14
Perspectives on Postsecondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity 20
Workshop Synthesis 20
Perspectives on Postsecondary Writing and Working Conditions 23
Workshop Synthesis 23
Perspectives on Postsecondary Writing, Accessibility and Technology 28
Workshop Synthesis 28
IMPLICATIONS (FOR POLICY, PRACTICE OR RESEARCH) 31
Statement on Language, Belonging, and Student Empowerment 32
Concepts of Belonging, Identity, Citational Justice, and Accessibility 33
Recommendations for Praxis for Writing Support and Writing Instructors 35
CONCLUSION 38
KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION ACTIVITIES 39
BIBLIOGRAPHY 40
APPENDICES 45
Appendix A: Post-Secondary Writing and Citational Justice 45

Panel Interview with Brian Hotson, Writing Centre Specialist; Christian Isbister (Métis), Indigenous Initiatives Librarian (UBC-O); Lorisia McLeod, Second Generation Indigenous Librarian (James Smith Cree Nation) (The Alberta Library); [Redacted]; Dr. Katja Thieme, Associate Teaching Professor Journalism, Writing, and Media (UBC) ... 45

Interview with Dr. Hannah McGregor, Director and Associate Professor of Publishing (SFU), Part One ... 60

Interview with Dr. Louis Maraj, Assistant Professor, School of Journalism, Writing, and Media (UBC) ... 67

Appendix B: Post-Secondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity ... 78

Panel Interview with Elizabeth Clarke, Learning Consultant, Academic Equity Programs (WLU); Dr. Nelesi Rodrigues, Assistant Professor, Institute for the Study of University Pedagogy (ISUP) (UT-M); Dr. Christin Wright-Taylor, Manager, Writing Centre (WLU) ... 78

Appendix C: Writing and Working Conditions ... 100

Interview with Dr. Mark Blaauw-Hara, Assistant Teaching Professor, Institute for the Study of University Pedagogy (ISUP) (UT-M); Dr. Julia Lane, Writing Services Coordinator (SFU) ... 100

Appendix D: Writing, Technology, and Accessibility ... 123

Panel Interview with Dr. Jay Dolmage, Professor and Chair, English (Waterloo); Dr. Laila Ferreira, Assistant Teaching Professor, School of Journalism, Writing, and Media (UBC) ... 123

Interview with Dr. Hannah McGregor, Director and Associate Professor of Publishing (SFU), Part Two ... 141

Appendix E ... 149

Call for Participants ... 149

Appendix F ... 152

Writing & Power: Artefact Breakdown ... 152

Writing & Power: Participant Breakdown by Institution ... 153

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

We acknowledge and respect the Lək̓ʷəŋən (Songhees and Xʷsepsəm/Esquimalt) Peoples on whose territory the university stands, and the Lək̓ʷəŋən and W̱SÁNEĆ Peoples whose historical relationships with the land continue to this day.

Background: The Issue

Academia – including universities, colleges, and funding agencies – privilege and value a certain meta genre, or overarching kind, of writing above all others: academic writing. Yet, academic writing is all too often part of the "hidden curriculum" or lessons and habits that students gain as part of tacit learning, role modeling, and internalizing (sometimes damaging) assumptions. Moreover, because this learning is often occluded, it can reproduce assumptions about "good" writing that are based on normalized whiteness and colonial frameworks. Academic writing professionals and administrators need accessible position statements, policy briefings, and resources to draw from so that they can create equitable, inclusive, and anti-oppressive academic writing praxes.

To meet these goals, our team held a series of virtual workshops in the fall of 2024 that invited keynote interviewees who are empowering students from marginalized and colonized populations to express their ways of knowing in academic contexts. In total, we interviewed 16 experts working in various areas of anti-oppressive academic writing praxis and over 40 workshop participants shared how they are challenging and dismantling systems of oppression often entrenched in academic writing.

In addition to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, we are indebted to the workshop participants, interviewees, the Island Deaf and Hard of Hearing Centre (IDHHC), Danica Paul (Knowledge Keeper and Lək̓ʷəŋən youth from the Songhees Nation) – who provided land acknowledgment and welcome for all the workshops – the technical support workers, Faculty of Humanities (especially the Research Office), and cleaning staff at the University of Victoria for making these workshops, and therefore this project, possible.

Objectives

Underfunded, overworked, and overlooked, many who teach and support student success in postsecondary writing struggle to empower marginalized and colonized student populations. Writing studies (also known as rhetoric and composition) is all but invisible across the national academic landscape. A major objective of this report is to make visible the communities of practice who are doing anti-oppressive work within writing studies. Of

equal importance is highlighting how writing practitioners and support specialists respect students' right to their own languages, histories, and cultures.

The intellectual generosity of our participants and interviewees has surpassed the expectations of this project. We received a total of 72 unique research and teaching materials from 21 postsecondary institutions across what is now called Canada. We also conducted 16 interviews and gathered rich and robust notes from workshop discussions with writing support staff, writing centre managers and coordinators, tenured and untenured research and teaching faculty, writing program administrators, graduate and undergraduate students, and librarians.

Results & Key Messages

Across the four workshops (Postsecondary Writing and Citational Justice; Postsecondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity; Postsecondary Writing and Working Conditions; and Postsecondary Writing, Accessibility, and Technology), participants and interviewees overwhelmingly agreed that writing across disciplinary fields is taught in ways that over-privilege one form of communication: Standardized Academic English (SAE). SAE eschews the evolving narratives and cultural histories of marginalized and colonized student populations.

The grey literature and interviews we gathered and conducted resulted in resources that can enrich and inform academic writing support and teaching in the following ways:

1. A position statement that sets forth the theoretical foundations of anti-oppressive, anti-racist, anti-ableist writing instruction and support. In turn, the statement provides practical ways to apply these theoretical principles.
2. Interviews and resources generously provided by participants and interviewees will be published (with permission) on an open-source platform managed by the University of Victoria Libraries).[1]

Methodology (search methods, selection criteria, data collection and analysis)

Our methodology involved a three-stage process that began with receiving Human Research Ethics (HRE) approval (#24-0123) to circulate a Call for Participants (Appendix E). In order to collect grey literature for the project (and in the spirit of reciprocity and community building), we held four thematic workshops; we asked participants to submit unpublished materials as a crucial part of workshop attendance. We also invited keynote

[1] Please note that participants and interviewees who requested anonymity did so to protect themselves. Their contributions are equally important and greatly appreciated.

interviewees who answered relevant questions (Appendices A, B, C, and D) to both inform participants and provide more data regarding anti-oppressive, anti-racist, anti-ableist writing instruction and support. Interviewees were invited based on their expertise in this kind of anti-oppressive work.

Stage two involved conducting the workshops, ensuring Lək̓ʷəŋən protocols were followed as per guidance provided by the Office of Indigenous Academic and Community Engag (Songhees and Xʷsepsəm/Esquimalt) ement (IACE) at the University of Victoria. Prior to each workshop, participants and interviewees were invited to share any accommodations they might need. The Island Deaf and Hard of Hearing Centre provided captionists and interpreters for each workshop. We baked trauma-informed pedagogies into the workshops to help participants feel comfortable, welcome, and accommodated.

Post-workshop (or stage three), we conducted feminist and Burkean rhetorical analyses of workshop materials, interviews, and discussions. Co-investigators discussed intersections and divergences between participants, materials, and interviewees. When knowledge synthesis and dissemination began, we invited participants and interviewees to share their comments and suggestions in the draft report.

Self-Location Statements

Dr. Sara Humphreys is a settler whose family on her father's side came to Toronto (covered by Treaty 13 with the Mississauga's of the Credit) from Swindon, England. Her mother's side of the family came to Treaty 9 territory, traditional territory of Cree, Moose Cree (which is now called Kapuskasing, Ontario) by way of Ireland and the United States. Sara currently lives with respect and gratitude as an uninvited guest on Lək̓ʷəŋən (Songhees and Xʷsepsəm/Esquimalt) territory.

Dr. Loren Gaudet is a settler whose mother's parents immigrated from Italy and whose father's family came from somewhere in Europe. She was born in Vancouver, on the traditional, ancestral and unceded land of the Musqueam and Squamish peoples and currently lives on traditional Lək̓ʷəŋən (Songhees and Xʷsepsəm/Esquimalt) territory.

Dr. Jason Collins is Confederated Tribes of Siletz and European settler on their mother's side and largely Irish settler on their father's. They were born in Portland, Oregon in what is now the US, and spent most of their life in Anchorage, Alaska on the land of the Dena'ina people. They are currently an uninvited guest, attempting to live on the lands of the Lək̓ʷəŋən (Songhees and Xʷsepsəm/Esquimalt) people in a good way.

Natalie Boldt is a settler on Lək̓ʷəŋən (Songhees and Xʷsepsəm/Esquimalt) territory. Her family are mostly German Mennonites who emigrated from Ukraine and Russia in the early

20th century. She was born in Vancouver, on the traditional, ancestral and unceded land of the Musqueam and Squamish peoples and grew up in the Fraser Valley on Stó:lō territory.

BACKGROUND: THE ISSUE

For undergraduate and graduate students (particularly those from underrepresented groups) to be heard and respected, postsecondary institutions must embrace more effective and inclusive forms of academic writing instruction and support (Hillocks, 1984, p. 160; Warner, 2018; Watson, 2018). There is an abundance of (primarily U.S.-based) research that makes clear inclusive approaches to writing support and instruction provide agency and fuel social change, among other benefits (Inoue & Poe, 2020; Marshall et al., 2012; MIT Teaching + Learning Lab, 2023; Park, 2023). There is no question academic writing is the cornerstone of postsecondary knowledge dissemination and acquisition; yet knowledge about academic writing in what is now called Canada is disparate, decentralized, and all but invisible.

Academic writing is often thought of in terms of correctness. The assumption that there is one universal standard of correct writing invites student work to be framed in terms of "lack" and "deficiencies" (Grayson et al., 2019). Often referred to as a "deficit framework," this "universal linguistic standard" (also called Standardized Academic English or SAE) is a significant systemic barrier to student success in postsecondary communication. Deficit frameworks are founded in discriminatory ideas about language use and compounded by significant funding shortfalls to support writing support and instruction.

Deficit frameworks situate nonstandard English language usage as an error. When writing instructors (and faculty and staff outside the field of writing studies) use deviations from SAE to justify assigning lower grades, they uphold the tradition of discriminatory language imperialism that can be traced back to the North American colonies (Canagarajah, 1999; Inoue, 2015). Postsecondary institutions were founded on discriminatory ideas of SAE superiority (Jenkins, 2013; Motha 2014). While the harm caused by linguistic superiority has long been a focus in writing studies, postsecondary institutions largely perceive SAE as the gold standard for communication. This perception means that even when writing instructors teach students that SAE is merely one of many legitimate forms of language use, outside the writing classroom the slightest misuse of SAE often earns students labels like "bad writers," "lazy," and "underprepared."

This knowledge synthesis project gathered anti-oppressive grey literature from instructors and staff working in 21 post-secondary institutions across what is now called Canada. We

collected 30 different research materials including toolkits, guides, grant proposals, conference papers, workshop presentations, policies, and dissertation excerpts, and 42 different teaching materials, including syllabi, lecture notes, assignments, and training materials. Our data shows that writing instructors and writing centre staff who teach in ways that respect student agency, thereby helping to remove barriers to postsecondary education, take risks to do this work. For example, many workshop participants and interviewees described the need for job security and academic freedom. They expressed a desire for better protections for writing centre staff and instructors advocating for marginalized students; improved training and disciplinary expertise for staff and precarious instructors alike; and were troubled by the disregard for the proven benefits of small writing class sizes (Horning, 2007; Arico, 2011; Isaacs, 2017; Phillips & Ahrenhoerster, 2018; Connelly et al., 2022).

Within these collected materials, many were researching and practicing anti-oppressive writing strategies; however, we also found that some instructors and support staff self-identified as providing anti-oppressive writing praxes but were, in fact, working from a deficit framework. This finding was unexpected, and points to a larger need for cross-institutional support and resource sharing, adaptable position statements, policy recommendations and more graduate programs in writing studies, rhetoric and composition, and communication.

OBJECTIVES

This funding opportunity offered a means to bridge a serious gap in disciplinary knowledge by highlighting the existing intersections between knowledges, marginalization, and academic writing in postsecondary institutions. Specifically, our activities were guided by the following questions: are underrepresented communities given opportunities to create space for the expression and evolution of their cultures and traditions in postsecondary academic writing classes and writing centres? Why and how have they been marginalized by the linguistic expectations of dominating cultures? What are the barriers that prevent their voices from being heard and accepted? How are multiracial, pluricultural, and multilingual dimensions acknowledged in the expectations of academic research and writing? How are belonging and identity bolstered and accommodated in postsecondary writing contexts?

Because so much of the knowledge production by writing studies experts in what is now called Canada is either siloed or shared outside of traditional publishing and knowledge networks, our team solicited grey literature from faculty and staff from across the

interdisciplinary span of writing studies (the field that researches academic writing, among other forms). Grey literature is common to writing studies because there are few publishing venues available to scholars (Clary-Lemon, 2009). While writing centre staff do publish (and their venues even more limited), they use grey literature on a day-to-day basis. Our goal was to gather and then synthesize the often siloed, unpublished, and hidden knowledge about academic writing with the aim of identifying strengths in anti-oppressive writing instruction and weaknesses where additional research, resources, and support are needed.

To balance grey literature with the tacit and experiential knowledges that many writing instructors possess, we chose to hold a series of four workshops in the fall of 2024, each of which addressed a theme emerging from the questions identified above. In September, we held two workshops: **"Postsecondary Writing and Citational Justice"** invited participants to share how they work to reverse racist and exclusionary research practices as well as how they help students understand and practice inclusive research. **"Postsecondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity"** asked participants to discuss how they use writing instruction to foster belonging in postsecondary classrooms, specific discourse communities, and in larger communities of scholars and writers.

In October, we held two more workshops: **"Postsecondary Writing and Working Conditions**" offered participants the opportunity to discuss the state of labour, including its precarity, that is common to writing instruction and support in postsecondary institutions in what is now called Canada. **"Postsecondary Writing, Accessibility and Technology"** gathered experts to critically examine the relationship between technology and accessibility, with an eye towards developing insights into opportunities (multimodality, accessibility, digital literacy) and challenges (academic integrity) for writing instruction.

Participants were able to take part in our workshops by sharing pedagogical or unpublished research materials with our team. Not only did we solicit materials from over 40 workshop participants (including documents like syllabi, assignment guidelines, lessons, unpublished research, and open educational resource), but we also supplemented these materials with interviews from 16 writing studies experts in what is now called Canada. Both the workshops we held and the materials we gathered provided us with the ability to synthesize and evaluate how postsecondary writing supports marginalized and underrepresented communities and cultures. In addition, we were also able to identify where further research is needed.

There are several outcomes produced from this knowledge synthesis project. First and foremost is a comprehensive position statement developed from workshop discussions, interviews, and grey literature designed to assist writing support staff, instructors, and administrators with engaging anti-oppressive pedagogical approaches, advocating for resources to support these approaches, and providing a language for this work. In addition to this robust position statement, we gathered rich resources that practitioners and administrators can adapt to evolve their approaches to writing instruction, support, and administration.

METHODS (SEARCH METHODS, SELECTION CRITERIA, DATA COLLECTION, AND ANALYSIS)

The first stage of the project involved obtaining Human Research Ethics (HRE) approval (#24-0123) to collect primary data. The current decentralized and disparate state of writing studies in what is now called Canada required both gathering grey literature for analysis and bringing staff, practitioners, students, and scholars together to share their institutional histories, teaching materials, and unpublished research. But many of our research participants are either precariously employed or have no academic freedom protections. Therefore, we sought an ethical means to protect our research subjects while fulfilling the goals of the project. To that end, sections of the transcripts in the appendices of this report and in the Results section are redacted to protect our participants and interviewees as per HRE guidelines.

We decided to run workshops not simply to gather grey literature and synthesize knowledge about anti-oppressive academic writing praxis but in order to meet a project objective to strengthen communities of practice in the field. The most effective workshops are interactive, facilitating debate and discussion as well as building community and alliances (which is sorely lacking in national writing support contexts). Workshops are a time-tested approach to share knowledge and “perform creative problem solving” in a “domain-specific” and focused environment (Ørngreen & Levinsen, 2017; see also Centre for Community Health and Development, n.d.). Our specific workshop methodological approach was both consultative and collaborative, which allowed for robust negotiation of meaning regarding what participants, interviewees, and even resource materials were defined as needed in national contexts (Ørngreen & Levinsen, 2017).

The next step was to share a Call for Participants (CFP), that was given HRE approval #024-0123 (Appendix E). We asked those who wished to participate in the workshops to provide an overview of the grey literature they wished to share as well as their roles and affiliations.

Workshop participants provided oral interpretations of the contexts that produced the grey literature in question. Prior to each workshop, we circulated the grey literature provided by participants and gathered by our team in a collaborative online space (SharePoint and MSTeams hosted by the University of Victoria). Because some participants were out of contract during the workshops, we had some trouble sharing materials, but in the end, we were able to offer most participants access.[2]

Each workshop began with an approved land acknowledgement and welcome as per both Lək̓ʷəŋən (Songhees and Xʷsepsəm/Esquimalt) protocols and the Office of Indigenous Academic and Community Engagement at the University of Victoria. We are grateful to Danica Paul (Knowledge Keeper and Lək̓ʷəŋən youth from the Songhees Nation) for opening the workshops in a good way. Following Danica's welcome, Dr. Loren Gaudet and Dr. Jason Collins provided an overview of trauma-informed workshop practices. Trauma-informed pedagogies build inclusive and safe spaces for participants to engage without fear. Our goal was to ensure participants and interviewees were warmly welcomed, treated with respect, and empowered.

Next, experts on the workshop theme were interviewed in panel style forums (for interview questions, see Appendices A, B, C and D). Post-interview, participants were separated into breakout rooms where they discussed their reactions to the interviews and the materials they submitted for the workshop. Breakout room participants subsequently moved into discussions regarding potential position statements and policies related to the theme, and we concluded the workshops with a sharing session in which all participants were encouraged to share their perspectives on the theme, the interviews, materials, policy statements, or anything they found interesting. We created transcripts of the interviews with writing studies experts (see Appendices A, B, C, and D), and research assistants took rigorous notes during the workshops (RAs were trained in fieldwork note-taking practice). Interviews are an effective method of gathering the interviewee's beliefs and perspectives on a focused topic, particularly when the interviewee is asked to reflect on a recent experience (Mann, 2016). Qualitative interview methodologies posit conversation as a "rich and indispensable means" to share and synthesize knowledge (Brinkman, 2022). Our methodological approach followed the concept of interviews as social and situated practice, asking for accounts of the keynotes' experiences in particular situations. This

[2] "Out of contract" means a precariously employed faculty or staff member has reached the end of their contract. They are often left in limbo waiting for another contract to begin (or not). In the meantime, the precariously employed faculty member or writing centre professional does not (usually) have access to any institutional system.

approach, common to discourse and rhetorical analysis, provides insight into *why* and *how* something works (Brinkman, "Discussion," 2022).

All aspects of the workshops and interviews were supported by University of Victoria A/V techs to ensure quality recordings. The RAs took notes on the workshop discussions and later transcribed the interviews using Microsoft 365 Transcription AI (approved by HRE #24-0123). Both RAs and the PI were given training in the ethical use of this technology by the University of Victoria Libraries (certificates available upon request). Participants and interviewees were given access to this report and appendices to review how they were represented. This type of transparency is crucial to ensure precariously employed writing centre staff and writing instructors, full-time staff and faculty, as well as managers and leaders have equal footing and representation.

The final stage of this project involved analyzing grey literature, interviews, and discussions via Burkean and feminist rhetorical practice. We engaged rhetorical theorist Kenneth Burke's concept of "Terministic Screens" to frame our analysis of materials. For Burke, language is symbolic action – language *does* things. When we use language, part of what we do is shape our realities. As Burke so elegantly puts it, "Even if any given terminology is a reflection of reality, by its very nature as a terminology it must be a selection of reality; and to this extent it must function also as a deflection of reality" (1969, 45). For the purposes of this report, we used this concept of terministic screens to consider how certain ways of understanding writing studies as a field from different positions affected participants' praxis. For example, we explored how writing centre staff are perceived differently from writing faculty and vice versa. Not only did Burke's rhetorical perspectives help us to ensure our own language "filtering system" did not obscure others' perspectives, but also to report and synthesize the varied perspectives we were seeing in the data.

Feminist rhetorical approaches counter the normalized and popular neo-Aristotelian approach that tends to frame language use in terms of binary argumentation (e.g. this side or that side). Certainly, there is nothing wrong with debate or winning an argument, but the goal of these workshops was to synthesize, which is a rhetorical form that seeks common ground (Ede & Lunsford, 1984). The idea is to identify divergence but build synthesis and perhaps even consensus. In addition, a common precept that guides feminist rhetorical practice is to value all voices, a key goal for this project.

RESULTS

We collected, analyzed, and synthesized interviews with experts in writing studies from institutions nationally. Over the course of 4 workshops, we interviewed 13 writing studies experts. We also interviewed an additional three experts who were unable to attend workshops due to conflicts. The workshops also provided opportunities to engage in intensive discussions with participants from institutions across Canada. All together, we hosted a total of 45 participants from institutions in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia (for a full breakdown of participants by institution, see Appendix F).

Prior to the workshops, we collected a total of 72 samples of grey literature, which we categorized as either "research" or "teaching" material (see Table 1).

Research Materials	
Toolkits, Guides, and Resource Repositories	7
Research/Grant Proposals and Project Briefs	7
Academic Posters, Conferences Papers/Presentations	5
Workshops and Instructional Presentations	8
Personal Essays/Reflections	1
Dissertation Excerpts	1
Unit/Program Statements or Policies	1
Subtotal	**30**
Teaching Materials	
Syllabi & Syllabus Excerpts	12
Lecture/Instructional Slides	4
Assignment/Activity Guidelines	21
Tutor Training Materials	7
Subtotal	**42**
Total	**72**

Table 1. Overview of Grey Literature

These interviews, discussions, and materials are the basis for our analysis. Per the structure of our workshops, the following sections are organized around our four key themes: Postsecondary Writing and Citational Justice; Postsecondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity; Postsecondary Writing and Working Conditions; and Postsecondary Writing, Accessibility, Technology.

Perspectives on Postsecondary Writing and Citational Justice

Our first workshop, held September 24, 2024, focused on teaching, practicing, and supporting citational justice. The sources researchers cite and the voices they value and promote reveal much about researchers' education, canons, and methods of research. From the exclusion of Indigenous theories (Todd, 2016) to the historical erasure of women (Glenn, 1997) and particularly the erasure of Black women (Hull, Bell-Scott, and Smith, 1982), citational justice, more than using the occasional marginalized author, means reversing racist, discriminatory, and exclusionary research practices. Citational justice requires a rethinking of the very foundations of the academy; it requires introducing new methods of research, asking new questions, and imagining new ways of teaching.

Workshop Synthesis

While citations are often considered a defining characteristic of academic writing, and are a core learning outcome of most, if not all, first-year writing courses in what is now called Canada, the interviews and discussions for the workshop on citational justice called for a rethinking of the reliance on teaching citational formatting according to a rigid style guide, such as MLA or APA.

Lorisia MacLeod, Learning Services Librarian for the Alberta Library, and author of "More Than Personal Communication: Templates for Citing Indigenous Elders and Knowledge Keepers" (2021), challenges what she calls the "citational status quo" (Appendix A). MacLeod describes citational justice in the following way:

> I think of it the same way I look at the difference between law versus justice. Citational laws are the styles and rules: "do this, don't do that." Citational justice is about a broader practice....[S]imilar to the justice system, I'd like to think continuous improvement can be made. Also, similar to the justice system, I think there are past harms academia and citation have been involved in that we cannot, nor should we, forget. We may or may not be able to redress them, but we can use them to inform a better tomorrow. (Appendix A)

[Redacted] invited our participants to reflect on what it might look like to depart from citational styles altogether: "What if we said 'no citational styles for one year' and then see

what students do to cite? What do they think? What matters to them? Sure, for many that idea seems just out there, but listen, if you want to change the status quo, you need to try wild ideas and fail. You may not need to implement them but at least critically engage with them" (Appendix A).

Another theme that emerged in this workshop was the tension between university administrations, policies, and actual change. And for many of our interviewees, the opportunity for change begins with students. As [redacted] pointed out, one of the issues in making change at the institutional level is the glacial pace institutions evolve. Everything is hierarchical and has to trickle down: a policy is changed, then units enact the policy, and staff and faculty put it in place (Appendix A). [Redacted] explains that postsecondary institutions really need to consider the emotional labour and toll in asking students and staff to take up this kind of work (Appendix A). The institution may "talk about diversity and inclusion," but there is a difference between "welcoming someone in and giving them a place to sit" (Appendix A).

[Redacted] sees students as catalysts for change: what if students are empowered to make small changes themselves, because these "small changes can encourage larger changes" (Appendix A). As a member of their institution's writing centre, [redacted] tries to enact more change through student engagement because, as they explain,

> While we are aligned with the institution, we don't wait for change. And yet even saying something like that is dangerous because staff can't push back. As well, students [and staff] can get into power imbalances with instructors, who want only APA citation or materials that have gone through Western publishing systems but not considered other knowledge sources, such as Indigenous ways of knowing. At the writing centre, we have conversations with students about bringing Traditional Knowledge (TK) into their work and how that can happen while meeting the instructor's expectations. We give students the tools to have these kinds of discussions. (Appendix A)

Brian Hotson, Writing Centre Specialist, adds, "The way to affect change is through students. The last thing the administration wants is bad press" (Appendix A). And yet, a drawback of this project is the lack of student input. While undergraduate student researchers attended the workshops as part of larger projects, they did not participate as much (or at all) as attendees. While a definite strength is the valuing of writing centre staff and precarious faculty, the student perspective is needed. In sum, the university system tips toward giving faculty too much power.

Writing support staff need more agency and additional protections when they are asked to tackle complex matters such as citational justice. Without access to wealth or job security/academic freedom to push back, support staff can't fully advocate either for students or suggest necessary changes when they see, for example, racist assignments. [Redacted], a university leader, explained that while a public controversy may be "unpleasant" for a stably employed faculty member, that same controversy may be devastating for a precarious faculty or staff member. Activism, according to [redacted], takes up resources and requires leaders to defend faculty from positions they take on issues. But this type of defence is not available to writing support staff, who are, in point of fact, performing a type of teaching.

A possible solution to this disparity is to extend policies on academic freedom and protections from retribution to writing centre staff. If writing centre staff had access to the same types of protections and tenure that librarians enjoy, they could be more effective in empowering marginalized students and making suggestions to faculty about course and assignment design in terms of writing. Building on this point, Katja Thieme, Assistant Professor of Teaching in the Department of English Language and Literatures at the University of British Columbia, emphasizes that academic freedom is a privilege that is "not evenly distributed" (Appendix A).

Hotson suggests that writing centre staff benefit from partnering with faculty, especially junior faculty who are learning how postsecondary institutions operate. As a senior administrator and writing centre director, Hotson explains he would call faculty "friends of the centre" (Appendix A) while also pointing out that institutions generally can't be allies because the institutional goal is to maintain the status quo. Instead of relying on institutions, Hotson suggests that coalitions across campus, such as amongst English departments, student unions, and writing centres, are ways to make real change.

Citational justice, and injustice, has tangible implications at the institutional level. Thieme notes that all policies are genres "produced through processes and these processes also involve citation," but these citational processes are hardly transparent; in fact, "they are untraceable in some ways" (Appendix A). To explain by way of example, Thieme shares the experience of a grassroots disability rights group that wrote documents pressuring the institution to make change. This group had a growing profile, but the administration refused to engage with the specific criticisms being raised in these documents. Rather than including this group as part of a task force or even citing their work as part of the task force, the university omitted the group. This type of omission is an example of citational injustice. The advocacy group is silenced, and others who are in ideological alignment with the institution are foregrounded.

For many participants, citational justice is about addressing systemic institutional racism through citation as well as creating academic spaces in which marginalized and colonized students, faculty, and staff feel a sense of belonging because they see their contributions will be valued. According to Hotson, “I've worked in 3 different institutions now, and the inherent racism and colonial reinforcement at the highest levels of the administration is astounding” (Appendix A). Where Hotson reflected on barriers to citational justice work at the administrative level, Indigenous Initiatives Librarian at UBC-O Christian Isbister (Métis) reflected on barriers that emerge at the faculty level. For his part, Isbister observed that even as an Indigenous Initiatives librarian who specializes in citational justice, he has few tangible opportunities to engage students on this issue. The clearest opportunities to do so are classroom visits. However, Isbister noted that the problem with classroom visits is that they require an invitation from faculty members. “I can go rogue,” he reflected, and talk about citational justice “maybe once,” but “if I do that and the faculty is not on board, then I just don’t get invited again” (Appendix A). Addressing racism whether at the institutional or classroom level is not easily done and inevitably requires more work on the part of the instructor or staff member (and at great personal risk).

Assistant Professor in the School of Journalism, Writing, and Media at the University of British Columbia Dr. Lou Maraj argues that citational justice entails fundamentally rethinking what justice and reference look like. For Maraj, even well-meaning efforts to address the politics of citation will fall short if they rely on what he called the “extractive logics” of the institution (Appendix A). Maraj is critical of citational justice statements, which tend to emphasize the necessity of diversity without undermining or overhauling the transactional and extractive politics of citation as it’s practiced in academia.

Intersectionality has, Maraj criticizes, been “co-opted” to a certain extent by the neoliberal politics of the university such that “citational justice” often becomes a “representational politics game.” Citational justice statements, he observed, often use the language of the “multiply marginalized ... almost to imply that the more oppressed someone is, the more they’re worth citing” (Appendix A). This framework is counter to authentic justice in two ways: it (1) tokenizes a select few authors who then become over-represented in a particular conversation, field, or discipline and (2) focuses attention on who people are citing and away from the types or “forms of knowledge” they’re rendering “legitimate” through reference (Appendix A).

Reflecting on the major challenges that instructors face when it comes to teaching citation and citational justice to students, Maraj observed that entrenched institutional expectations about legitimate and necessary knowledge were difficult to navigate. The

institution, he asserted, has expectations about what and how students will learn. For example, there are expectations around the type of project, paper, or assessment deemed necessary in a particular course; the number of sources to address or include in a paper or other assessment; the amount of writing that needs to be done in a particular course – all regardless of context or demographics. Institutions will also surveil instructors and staff through various means (e.g., course evaluations, observations, and reviews) to ensure that those expectations are met. But what if the foundational premises about legitimate learning, knowledge, and ways of communicating are limited and flawed? Maraj, again, draws attention to the problematic "logics" that govern the institution and inform "legitimate" scholarship and scholarly activity (Appendix A). In an effort to countermand those logics, Maraj asks students to reflect on what is legitimate to them, asking them to reflect on their position and the communities to which they belong and the voices and knowledges they're calling into conversation around their identities.

Reflecting on what "advice" he would give to writing instructors and centre staff and, similarly, what he considers "crucial" to include in a position statement on citational justice, Maraj hesitated, noting that he "feel[s] like there's never a one size fits all response for really anything" and, likewise, that policies and statements generally unconsciously replicate the extractive logics endemic to the postsecondary institution (Appendix A). Nevertheless, the advice he offered was similar to the guidance he provides his students. He invites writing instructors, centre staff, and program administrators to interrogate what they mean by citation and justice and "come to a place where we're engaging less with structural power and [the] mechanisms of structural power and more with each other" (Appendix A). Be "critical of what we perceive as knowledge," he urges, and, in the case of a position statement, think carefully about how this genre perpetuates the extractive logics he criticized earlier – "the extractive relationship that we have with activism and notions of quote unquote justice."[3] It's worth noting, too, that his initial response to the latter

[3] By way of example, Maraj recalled a study he undertook for a CCCC conference, which tracked the frequency with which scholars of colour who had either won an award at or chaired a CCCC conference were cited. Maraj found that of the scholars he tracked, there were three who were cited consistently and many more who were cited less than 50 times. The implication was that the quality of their scholarship was not a significant factor in how often these authors were cited. Rather, Maraj suggested, the politics and mechanisms of a neoliberal intersectionality had tokenized three authors at the expense of all the others. Maraj also pointed to the way in which Kimberlé Crenshaw has become synonymous with intersectionality at the expense of historical figures from the Combahee River Collective to nineteenth-century abolitionists like Sojourner Truth to Anna Julia Cooper. "This is not," Maraj was quick to point out, "a critique of Kimberlé Crenshaw," who, he noted earlier, "is important to the formulation of intersectional theory in the academy." Rather, "this is a critique of how Crenshaw has been taken up" and how the idea of intersectionality has been decontextualized and tied to a single person – a critique of how Crenshaw and intersectionality have been "commodif[ied]" within the academy.

question about position statements was “might I suggest not writing a statement?” (Appendix A).

For their part, Associate Professor and Director of the publishing program at Simon Fraser University, Dr. Hannah McGregor also urges the relevant actors here to reflect on the forms that knowledge can and does take – including which forms are historically marginalized and undervalued within academia as well as the complexities associated with representing those forms of knowledge and expertise. These complexities include thinking about how to cite materials that “have not been conventionally citable” as well as “the ethics of who particular knowledge belongs to, what can and should be shared, how it can be shared, [and] how it can and should be acknowledged” (Appendix A). McGregor notes important tensions between the aims and goals of the open access movement (including efforts to digitize materials for accessibility) and the unique needs of community-based knowledge, which may be governed by important protocols. Indigenous scholars, she reminds us, have been drawing attention to these tensions for years. Not all information is supposed to be accessible to everyone at any time, and so, McGregor notes, “when we are thinking about what citational justice means in Canada, we need to be thinking about the degree to which our country is built on the systematic oppression and misappropriation of Indigenous knowledges and how neither fully appropriating those into our institutions, nor continuing to exclude them from our institutions is sufficient” (Appendix A).

Much like Maraj, who urges a reconsideration of key terms like “citation” and “justice,” McGregor also reflects on the need to think about what we mean by “ethics,” ethical citational practice, and ethical “engagement” with sources. They reference the work of Moya Bailey and Minelle Mahtani, both of whom go beyond institutional baselines for ethical source use in their practice. In her work on the use of hashtags in Black trans women’s online communities, Bailey (2020) recognized that the standard ethics approval practice at her institution was insufficient, “[a]nd so what she did,” explained McGregor, was create an Advisory Board of Black Trans Femmes to … guide her in her work, but also to make sure that she could do things that were useful for them as well” (Appendix A). As a professor at UBC, Mahtani has her students “choose one of the people whose work they engaged with during the semester and write to them to say how engaging with their work impacted them” (Appendix A). This practice, observes McGregor, emphasizes citation as reciprocity, which is a reframing that Maraj advocates for as well.

This commitment to citational justice, despite often requiring more labour on the part of instructors and staff, was also apparent in the grey literature we collected. For example, workshop participant Dr. Laila Ferreira and colleagues from the School of Journalism, Writing and Media at the University of British Columbia (UBC), created a blog to support

anti-racist writing instruction, *Anti-Racist Toolkit for the Teaching of Writing*. In explaining why they created this resource, Ferreira et al. (2024) write:

> We recognize that UBC is a diverse community of people from many different parts of the world and from many different backgrounds who come to live and learn together at UBC on the traditional, ancestral and unceded lands of the Musqueam people, Vancouver campus, and the Syilx people of the Okanagan Nation, Kelowna campus. We also recognize that colonialism is ever present in the systems and structures of UBC as an institution. Many members of systemically and persistently marginalized communities, including BIPOC, 2SLGBTQIA+, Disabled, and low-socioeconomic status (SES) students, staff, and faculty, will often not find themselves reflected in the classrooms and workplaces (including writing classrooms) of UBC. Scholarly research writing is itself understood to act as a tool of colonialism in maintaining colonial hierarchies by ensuring that membership to the scholarly community is granted only to those whose use of language and writing practices adhere to white supremacist standards.

The above demonstrates the intensive labour and initiative required to produce resources in the service of citational justice and anti-oppressive writing praxis, for the unique and complex context of what is now called Canada. While there is a divergence of opinion on whether to create statements, policies, and manifestos concerning citational justice, all participants and interviewees asserted that conventional academic citational practice requires a sea change.

Perspectives on Postsecondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity

Identity, the need to be a “respected and valued member of a group,” is fundamental to the University experience (Marshall et. al, 2012, p. 118). For example, small writing classrooms, particularly first-year writing classrooms, continue to foster student identity and belonging in ways not available to larger survey courses. Yet, for many multiply marginalized university students in what is now Canada, identity and belonging remain elusive (Chariandy, 2007; Walcott, 2003).

Workshop Synthesis

Interviews, workshop discussions, and grey literature emphasized that the hidden curriculum of writing (and navigating university expectations more generally) has a greater impact on marginalized students, such as first-generation students, Indigenous students, racialized students, and international students. In response to a question about institutional barriers, Dr. Nelesi Rodrigues, Assistant Professor in the Institute for the Study

of University Pedagogy, University Toronto Mississauga, noted: “I think that the first barrier that came to mind is…what we often refer to as the hidden curriculum, right, that historically marginalized populations need to learn, in addition to whatever it is that they are studying and the role that the universities can play and help them navigate that hidden curriculum” (Appendix B). Whether or not an institution is prepared to support marginalized students as they acquire this hidden curriculum often depends on things like the institution’s international student population, whether faculty with expertise in anti-racist pedagogies are present, and funding for resources like learning centres that help students “learn to university.”

Participants also highlighted the role of visibility in cultivating belonging, pointing to the role that administrators or those in positions with hiring power to ensure that students are able to see themselves in the institution. Dr. Christin Wright-Taylor, Manager of Writing Services at Wilfrid Laurier University, emphasized the importance of cultivating space that challenges white supremacy: “I realized that as a white, well-educated woman, I embody white supremacy whenever I get in front of the room, whenever I'm the one talking, leading” (Appendix B). Speaking about marginalized students, Wright-Taylor explained: “They don't see themselves in the writing director. Like *me*. And so, it's really important for me to hire inclusively. And so, being, we've been very intentional the last couple of years of overhauling our hiring practices and making sure that we have identified our outcomes for the learning, for the for the interview process.… [W]e promote through our Accessible Learning Centre, we promote through CSEDI [Centre for Student Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion], we promote through the Indigenous Student Centre, like really reaching out to these populations” (Appendix B).

Further explaining this idea of visibility as a strategy for challenging barriers, Elizabeth Clarke, Learning Consultant at Wilfrid Laurier University, shared that many marginalized folks don’t even “visualize themselves attending postsecondary education.” In her interview, Clarke outlined her personal experience: “When I was graduating [high school] and thinking about college or university (I also have a background in child welfare and being adopted).… The stats [show that children in the] child welfare [system]…[are less likely to attend postsecondary school]…[and are more at risk of dropping out and facing similar challenges]” (Appendix B). The limited exposure to role models and representation means that Clarke could not picture herself in postsecondary education. The same holds true for first generation students: they have no mentors in their families to say, “oh right, here’s how to do this or that.” Clarke ties visibility to the overt and subtle racism that her students experience:

> [T]he students I work with [often tell me they don't feel like they belong] especially being on a predominantly white campus and trying to navigate that the best that they can in their classrooms, while sometimes they're [trying to navigate their classrooms while dealing with] overt or sometimes subtle racism… How do they have those conversations[?] If it's [with a] professor, can [they speak up]? Who [can they turn to] ?...[It's important to recognize that] educational environments are not always culturally responsive or inclusive. (Appendix B)[4]

According to the materials we analyzed, faculty and staff are aware of the role that academic writing instruction can play in cultivating belonging and making space for marginalized and colonized students to express their identities and cultural narratives. On the other hand, instructors and writing centre staff are also aware of the punitive, oppressive, and silencing potential that writing instruction and support can hold. For example, Wright-Taylor identifies a tension of working in the writing centre, trying to support students' right to their own language in contexts where some faculty demand SAE: "We find ourselves in an interesting spot, though in the institution because we are not in charge of the curriculum, and we're not in charge of training the faculty. So, we're in this weird place of, like, we're empowering the students and letting them know there's nothing wrong with you. You're not faulty. You're not broken" (Appendix B). This comment highlights a larger issue with the deficit framework from which many instructors continue to teach, and points to a need for adequate resources and training in anti-oppressive writing pedagogies.

While many of the instructors who attended the workshops are doing this kind of work, not all instructors are. For example, it is crucial to point out that our CFP, which we used to recruit workshop participants, employed the language of anti-oppressive writing instruction: "Our SSHRC funded project seeks to make postsecondary writing support more inclusive with your help. Those of us who work with students to support their writing regularly confront and challenge oppressive norms that reproduce ableism, whiteness, Standardized English, and colonization (among other intersectional oppressions)" (Humphreys et al., 2024). Therefore, instructors who teach from a deficit framework were not likely hailed by this CFP and are not represented in our collected materials.

Moreover, within the submissions received as part of this knowledge synthesis project – from instructors, staff, and students who identify as doing anti-oppressive work – we found that there were materials that reinforced Standardized Academic English (SAE). These materials may have been produced through a motivation to do anti-oppressive work; however, they reinforce normalized whiteness and appropriate Indigenous ways of

[4] Elizabeth Clarke made changes to the original transcript upon her request.

knowing without following consultation or citational protocols. These materials are important because they point to a disjunction between a desire to do anti-oppressive work through teaching or supporting writing and a lack of resources and training to do the work in a culturally appropriate and sensitive way with consultation, reciprocation, and self-reflection. In other words, anti-oppressive writing instruction is not simply attitudinal, but it also must be supported with scholarship, training, and resources to ensure that students are not inadvertently harmed in the process.

Perspectives on Postsecondary Writing and Working Conditions

Workshop three explored issues of labor in writing studies. As Clary-Lemon (2009) and Phelps (2014) note, teaching postsecondary writing in what is now called Canada is often viewed as a service of English departments with priorities that tend to trivialize if not ignore postsecondary writing altogether. Perhaps equally if not more problematic, writing centre staff are often precarious and have fewer protections from employer discipline for advocacy work. This devaluing of writing courses and support often leads to postsecondary writing courses that are taught by non-tenure track, temporary, and precariously positioned instructors who receive little to no training, poor compensation, and often untenable workloads (Schell and Stock, 2001; Yusoff, Khan, Rasheed, & Aamir, 2020).

Workshop Synthesis

Throughout the workshop we heard from writing program administrators, instructors, librarians, and writing centre staff about the state of working conditions at their institutions. What was either implicitly stated or noted in the other workshops became salient in our workshop focused on working conditions. As one interviewee fulfilling two roles in a single position put it, “I feel quite tired” (Lane, Appendix C). Many participants expressed exhaustion from working multiple positions, working precarious positions, added emotional or “shadow” labour, teaching unmanageable class sizes, and handling demands from upper administrators. Overwhelmingly, participants and interviewees working in writing centres described being in liminal positions as both staff and advocates for students. Indeed, the lack of academic freedom and job security for writing centre staff means they are unable to enact institutionally mandated policies, including (but not limited to) access, belonging, equity, and anti-racism.

Of equal concern for instructors and writing program administrators and coordinators is the workload, stress, and the disciplinary vacuum caused by precarious employment and

overwork. During a discussion session in the workshop, UBC Associate Professor of Teaching, Dr. Katja Thieme shared preliminary data on class size in what is now called Canada. Out of 15 institutions, only one offers first-year writing courses at or below the suggested 20 student course cap. Nine have courses capped between 24-30, and five institutions have caps at 30 or above.

Compounding the issue of workload in both Canada and the U.S., explains Assistant Teaching Professor at the University of Toronto, Mississauga (UTM), Dr. Mark Blaauw-Hara, is the fact that writing courses are overwhelmingly taught by precarious faculty who are hired course by course, which impacts program functionality. For example, academic writing (in fact, composing in general) is taught iteratively and is informed by practice, scholarship, and "the lore picked up from working in a vibrant community" (Appendix C). But that "lore" is difficult to embed when instructors are working from one contract to the next and don't know if they'll be returning term to term. This loss of program and course history is a serious issue, because writing pedagogies are very much about context and place: each program has its own demographics and pressures, which are lost when there is little employment stability.

Blaauw-Hara often asks how much work should he be giving precarious faculty? How much is too much? Contingent faculty require support, but how much support is needed? Trying to organize professional development for instructors who have such differing levels of expertise is difficult: "I ask myself, like, how much benchmarking can I ask people to do if…they anticipate that they're only going to be teaching one course for us.… [H]ow much pre-reading can I ask new instructors to do?" (Appendix C). While a strength of this project revolves around asking how labour practices impact teaching, a definite weakness is that we were not able to gather as many materials as we would have liked regarding precarity.

There is a significant lack of graduate degree programs in writing studies fields, especially in teaching and research. Therefore, writing courses are often taught by instructors that require program and faculty support to learn wise disciplinary practices. As [redacted], a university leader, notes, teaching and research are inextricably connected, but precariously employed instructors are not encouraged (or paid) to conduct research (anonymized interview E). Both [redacted] and Blaauw-Hara are on the same page with this issue. Therefore, the current research in anti-oppressive pedagogies, disability studies approaches, and other pedagogies that are evolving in the field are likely not appearing in writing classrooms taught by contingent faculty. Quite simply, "[p]recarious employment is bad for everyone" (Lane, Appendix C).

Dr. Julia Lane, Writing Services Coordinator at Simon Fraser University, is a unique case in that her unit was recently moved into a Faculty Association, which comes with better protections but perhaps not as many as some might imagine. Lane shares that the "lore"– as Blaauw-Hara calls such knowledge – is lost via staff cuts. Further, those in temporary positions are hesitant to invest too much of themselves, which is a loss for the students, colleagues and postsecondary institutions. They have to hustle for other work, which also takes away from the work they want to do for students and the university. There is a consistent fear that the "bottom might drop out," and staff will return to precarity, food insecurity, housing issues.

Even when instructors and writing support folks are invested, they often are not credentialed in ways that are meaningful in the postsecondary system. They are not interpellated as "real" within the postsecondary hegemony. The postsecondary system and its HR systems encourage following the status quo; therefore, if staff speak up, contracts might not be renewed. Therefore, explains Lane, advocacy work becomes a matter of, quite literally, doing "what [we can] to make it easier for them to move on and get the types of jobs that are going to respect them and help them have some security in their lives and help them feed their families" (Appendix C).

But even though writing centre staff have opportunities to join Faculty Associations at some institutions, the hierarchical divide between faculty and staff looms large. Staff are not allowed to take on certain roles, even if they have the "correct" credentialing, such as a PhD. The stratification of labour in postsecondary institutions is highlighted by those in academic writing fields because so many staff have the same credentials as faculty yet are treated as second class citizens.

In terms of precarious faculty, transparency is key, explains Blaauw-Hara, to alleviate some of the stress of precarity. The goal is to show what the program has control over and what can't be controlled (e.g. budgets, staffing approvals and so on). Part of that transparency is being cognizant of how discombobulating it is to teach in varied units and even postsecondary institutions (different LMS, gradebooks and so on). Blaauw-Hara creates videos for precarious faculty, so they understand how to do things, like post grades and so on, which is necessary but labourious.

Blaauw-Hara recommends a resource for writing program administrators and coordinators, an article by Karl E. Weick, "Improvisations as a Mindset," where he uses jazz as an analogy for leadership. In a healthy organization, everyone is giving and taking in the same key and knows the basic structure of the song. Each position needs to be

respected as contributing to the overall song. Blaauw-Hara asks “What’s the structure of the song we want to perform in a writing course? What are some of the threshold concepts we want our students to engage with over the course of a term, what are the readings or discourse communities. Rhetoric, genre analysis we want our students to engage with in that semester?” (Appendix C). Writing coordinators and administrators are tasked with helping the precarious instructors employed in a given term to play that song but maybe improvise and riff a bit. Blaauw-Hara tries to balance providing materials and training that will help precarious instructors join in and share their own expertise.

There are ways to respect instructors by giving precarious faculty rationales, so they know that faculty aren't just providing materials “to feel good about ourselves” (Appendix C). He adds that building a cohesive community or “songbook” requires showcasing good teaching, providing awards, and finding additional ways to show a teaching team that a program, department, or writing centre is actually playing the same song in the same key, but that synchronicity can be covered in different ways.

Further, Blaauw-Hara urges faculty and postsecondary leaders to invite precarious faculty to serve on committees. This engagement is important when, for example, administrators want proof writing courses are working well. At the same time, Blauuw-Hara observes that while leaders may try for the “best conditions,” they are “still not good working conditions.” Like Lane, he recognizes that precarious instructors “want to move on” and so queries how to help them do so: “[H]ow can we make it easy for them to move on and get jobs that will respect them [and] have some security? How can we help our contingent workers get other jobs?” (Appendix C). A drawback of this particular workshop was the lack of attendance (less than 10 participants attended), and we could not find precarious instructors willing to speak to this issue, even anonymously. Indeed, two senior postsecondary leaders asked to be anonymized, which suggests that academic freedom does not provide enough protection to advocate for all levels of faculty, especially equity-deserving faculty.

Lane shares that academic freedom is crucial for those who work with students and support their composing/communication projects in courses across the postsecondary institution. Similar to the point made in the citational justice workshop (discussed in Postsecondary Writing and Citational Justice), advocating for students requires pushing back against those who may be overtly or subtly harming students in their classes. Lane joins a chorus of writing centre staff and managers who want more job security and protections, so that they can advocate more effectively for students. They also shared that they want their intellectual property protected from being co-opted in ways they don't

approve of. The academic ecosystem is not set up to allow writing support workers to voice their concerns. The lack of secure, protected working conditions means postsecondary anti-racism and anti-colonial policies can't be enacted as widely or effectively as they might be.

Further, Blaauw-Hara notes that teaching and supporting writing is undervalued and underfunded to a degree that makes doing the job prohibitively difficult. We need workshops and training for writing program administrators and coordinators so they can manage budgets, advocate effectively for staff and faculty, and improve working conditions. Every program needs a rationale for what they do and why they do it, so everyone can be on the same page when leadership changes over.

Blaauw-Hara recommends adopting the rhetoric of upper administrators to access the resources needed to support marginalized and colonized student populations. Some of the ways to handle deans and other administrators and get those all-important resources includes linking writing and communication to student retention and habits of persistence (learned in writing classrooms). In turn, Writing Program Administrators (WPA) can better justify asking for money and improving working conditions, such as small class sizes. Part of the rationale for position statements are these kinds of rhetorical situations.

Lane adds that being "underfunded is a symptom of being undervalued." Lane shares an article by Sandy Grande "Refusing the University," adding that we need to understand "where and when do we say no" (Appendix C). The denial of academic freedom means writing centre staff can't always do the necessary advocacy work to support, for example, a student's right to their own language or empowering marginalized and colonized students to express their narrative and cultural histories. Lane draws a careful parallel to W.E.B Du Bois' theory of the double consciousness (Lane points out that as a white woman, she can't understand the depth of Du Bois point about Black identities); yet as an analogy, writing centre folks are both staff and academics – they must live in two worlds simultaneously and that tension can be unbearable. Of course, this issue is much worse for BPOC and Indigenous colleagues both in writing centres and writing programs. There are no easy solutions to these issues but without resources and funding, marginalized and colonized student populations will lose out on a crucial type of academic support in their postsecondary journeys.

Perspectives on Postsecondary Writing, Accessibility and Technology

We concluded our workshops by discussing the intersections of accessibility and technology. Postsecondary writing has long been an area of research where new technologies are both questioned with skepticism and welcomed with intellectual curiosity (Andersson, 2018; Miller & Olson, 1994; Peterson & McClay, 2012). Accessibility, in writing, in research, and in education more generally, intersects with the use of and access to technology, broadly speaking. In fields and research areas like the digital humanities (Ridolfo, & Hart-Davidson, 2015), multimodal composition (Dilger & Rice, 2010), and digital rhetoric (Banks, 2006; Eyman, 2015), conversations on making technologies accessible and increasing access to technology take on central and formative roles.

Workshop Synthesis

Assistant Professor in the School of Journalism, Writing, and Media at UBC, Dr. Laila Ferreira notes that her unit is working on a major project on Artificial Intelligence (AI) in writing. She and her colleagues in the project are running pilots to test resources. With the advent of AI, Ferreira saw the return of a deficit mindset (e.g. "everyone is going to cheat" or use AI to write and so on). This deficit discourse focuses on how postsecondary institutions, faculty, and staff can control students through models that punish. But the project Ferreira is currently working on gives instructors the "opportunity to work through fears around AI and adapt their own teaching of writing to learn with students" (Appendix D).

Ferreira advocates that regardless of AI technology, instructors and writing support staff need to support students rather than assuming they are somehow AI experts who can navigate this technology. The fact is that many do not understand how it works. But many also use AI in ways that are helpful for them. Instructors and writing support staff need more than a privacy or academic integrity policy to help students navigate this contentious topic. In alignment with Ferriera's thinking is Dr. Sheila Batacharya, Assistant Teaching Professor at the Institute for the Study of University Pedagogy (University of Toronto). Batacharya's scholarship involves leveraging AI to show multilingual students across multiple asynchronous modules how AI is both deficient in paraphrasing sources and also helpful in other ways.[5]

Ferreira noted that her team is looking to build resources and learning strategies so instructors can redesign their courses "in order to take into account the changes AI is

[5] Dr. Batacharya's poster presentation is available on the open access site, which will go live in April/May, 2025.

creating in terms of how students are engaging with AI in our courses and writing" (Appendix D). Beyond this project, Ferreira raised another issue with revising teaching materials and redesigning courses. Many courses are taught by contingent faculty, especially writing courses. How can precarious instructors do this work? Where will the time come from to take up redesigning a course when contracts are so short? Again, while we held a workshop on working conditions, the intersection between the work of writing instruction and support and anti-oppressive writing praxis came up time and again. As Dr. Lane noted in her interview (Appendix C), being underfunded is expressly tied to being undervalued.

Professor and Chair of English at the University of Waterloo (UW), Dr. Jay Dolmage shared that UW has a universal writing requirement and shows concern about AI in the classroom. But Dolmage made clear that UW has a confused approach to AI use. There is not a cohesive campus-wide understanding of how to approach AI and integrate: "There is a lot of information but not much guidance" (Appendix D).

Dolmage shifted the interview toward discussing technological supports and disability. The types of technological supports normalized over the pandemic are the same supports disabled students fought tooth and nail for pre-pandemic. Postsecondary institutions claimed such technologies were prohibitively expensive and difficult to implement but now offer these resources regularly. Flexibility in attendance, note-taking, asynchronous learning and so on were only available at that crucial time in history because disabled students fought for these accommodations. Now postsecondary institutions want to modify or take these away due to cost. Disabled students "were asking for their bodies and minds to be understood in higher education" (Appendix D). Now we can slow things down by offering materials for students to access outside of class, explained Dolmage. What disabled students have been asking postsecondary institutions to enact for decades has now become standard. Put another way, when we serve the needs of disabled students, we serve all students' needs.

Ferreira agreed, adding that writing classes and support in and of itself builds accessibility into postsecondary education. Postsecondary institutions assumed that students knew how to use technologies; however, because we teach multimodal composing, writing practitioners experienced how much and little students know about digital composing. They require digital literacies, which are often tied to modes of composing.

Dolmage makes clear that accessibility has had its meaning vacuumed out by postsecondary institutions. From an institutional point of view, accessibility currently seems to mean meeting but not exceeding a standard. Dolmage notes, "Disability plus accessibility means something to me. But increasingly that's meant something that is

focused on disability rights versus justice." This shift has occurred because institutions look to a legal model "which is minimal and has a ceiling" and "checklistif[ies]" accessibility (Appendix D). Much like the word "belonging," the word "accessibility" means next to nothing, because postsecondary institutions are increasingly about empty branding over accountability, consultation, real engagement and funding. For many instructors, accessibility amounts to "a line in your syllabus that refers people out of your class" asserted Dolmage, which reassures instructors that "they don't have to change anything" (Appendix D). Dolmage explained 75% of University of Waterloo students will never share they have a disability and "that's true across most universities in Canada" (Appendix D). According to Dolmage, accessibility is more than simply more time on tests. We need to debate accessibility and how to implement it.

Ferreira added that accessibility to her "is about teaching from the ground up as the class being a social learning space. We're all responsible for each other's learning. It's about attending to differences I and the students bring to the learning situation: culture, background, race" (Appendix D). Instructors and writing centre staff need to make our learning spaces accessible over and above the minimum requirements, so students do not have to ask for accommodation. For writing instructors and writing centre staff that can mean addressing anxieties over writing, making sure students don't face barriers to learning (such as enforcing SAE) and so on.

Dolmage agreed that more can be done, urging all of us to be "willing to rethink everything. We must rethink what writing is" (Appendix D). For example, Dolmage shared he has completely rethought what attendance and participation mean.[6] Instead of patting ourselves on the back for learning names, perhaps we should consider what kind of attendance and participation actually helps students?

Dolmage provided workshop participants with a list of accessibility measures instructors and writing centre staff can implement right now: instructors need to be assessing students far less, and writing centre staff can encourage this approach. Writing instructors seem to fetishize assessment – there is so much research on assessment but how much do instructors really need to ask our students to do? What if instructors ask for less writing, but more iteration, then we are really getting to the heart of what composing pedagogies are asking us to do. Connect more with students, do more iterative work and include fewer assessments.

---

[6] Dolmage's attendance policy will be shared on our open-access platform, which will go live April/May, 2025.

Both Dolmage and Ferreira agreed that the deficit model where students are accused of cheating or misusing AI or even told that listening to a book is not the same as reading are all ways to exclude students. AI can increase access and so can other technological tools, but they need to be designed to support students, not "catch" them.

IMPLICATIONS (FOR POLICY, PRACTICE OR RESEARCH)

This project is the first time since the now defunct Canadian Association for the Study of Language and Learning (CASLL, 1984-2015) that there has been such resource and research sharing in composing pedagogies, writing studies, and other associated disciplines in what is now called Canada. Indeed, while the core founders of Inkshed and the Canadian Association of Language and Learning, professors emeriti Dr. Roger Graves and Dr. Heather Graves valiantly tried to create more areas for knowledge dissemination through traditional academic channels, such as associations and journals, perhaps the current state of decentralization, lack of research and collaboration venues, and severe under-resourcing of composing pedagogies as a field in what is now called Canada requires sustained cybercommunities to sow networks, pollinate communities of practice, and grow research.

Therefore, the implications of this knowledge synthesis promise to enrich the field (and related fields) for years to come. Our overall goal (see Objectives) was to gather important work or "grey literature" that informs this field but remains siloed in local pockets of academic research and teaching nationally. The sheer number of potential resources and research that could support students seeking to express their cultural narratives and histories is impressive (see Appendices A, B, C, and D for more information). That said, and as discussed in Results (above), many writing support workers, instructors, scholars, and anyone affiliated with writing instruction are deeply concerned about the deficit framework that informs how those who work in academia think about student writing. By "deficit framework," we mean dominant approach to academic writing instruction of all kinds that attributes failure or struggle to personal and individual shortcomings rather than systemic factors. Writing centres and writing programs, explains Rodrigues (Appendix B), were literally brought into being by postsecondary institutions opening the gates to marginalized and colonized student populations, but this role is extremely complicated by continued colonial attitudes that position Standardized Academic English (SAE) as a best and most desired form of academic communication.

SAE is a form of academic writing that reflects white, upper-middle class culture, excluding other ways of knowing through postsecondary grading policies, writing requirements, and academic integrity policies. In order to position SAE as the one form of correct writing that binds all other academic genres together, Rodrigues explains writing courses and centres in what is now called Canada have historically been spaces that try to "'fix' students who [don't] conform to certain [dominant] expectations of what students should look and sound like" (Appendix B). In alignment with Rodrigues, Wright-Taylor adds that "[w]hile writing centres and courses have vowed to support these students, sometimes this support has impeded learning" and has, instead, contradicted many students' ways of knowing and being. The legacy of colonial and racist histories seeps into classrooms and writing centres, no matter how well-meaning the instructor or support worker might be (Appendix B). Thus, concludes Rodrigues, "[o]ur work as writing studies scholars (and adjacent communities of scholarship) is to grapple with this...deficiency paradigm" (Appendix B).

In so doing, instructors and support staff can ensure marginalized and colonized student populations are given the support to "navigate institutions that are largely white, male, and ableist" and "create classroom environments where [student] identities are recognized and uplifted" (Rodrigues, Appendix B). As composing experts, we are tasked with creating spaces where Indigenous, BPOC, first generation, and other marginalized and colonized student populations understand that they are not deficient; rather the system was developed with white cultures and histories in mind. Because we are so underfunded, unrecognized and siloed, the following position statement (born out of workshops, interviews, and grey literature) is meant to assert a position agreed upon by an organization or discourse community. In this case, the following position statement is meant to provide a language and even impetus for eliminating the deficit framework that currently inhibits marginalized and colonized student populations from understanding and expressing their cultural histories, narratives and experiences.

Statement on Language, Belonging, and Student Empowerment

Writing and Power Workshop Series

Fall 2024

This statement is informed by the assumption that language, power, and action are interconnected. Instructors, support staff, scholars, and administrators of writing provided the knowledge to compose this statement, which reflects the context of what is now called Canada. The goals of this statement are:

- to increase understanding about how power operates in, around, and through language;
- to identify the power of students' languaging practices;
- to recognize the power of writing centre staff, administrators, managers and writing instructors to build on students' languaging practices and the need to increase capacity to uplift them;
- to spark continued conversation about the need for linguistic access and equity, in our scholarship, support work, and teaching;
- and to cultivate more conscientious, responsible, and socially just ways to engage with language, language use, and student needs.

With these goals in mind, we have divided this statement into two main sections. The first, Concepts of Belonging, Identity, Citational Justice, and Accessibility, outlines principles of language and languaging as a dynamic process always connected to identities, cultures, action, and power. Based on primary data gathered at the SSHRC-funded Writing & Power Workshop series held virtually in fall 2024, combined with current research in linguistics, composing, and rhetoric, this section provides insight into the historical and current state of academic writing (including multimodal composing) in what is now called Canada. This section also provides insight into, and sets the foundation for, our thinking about the connections among language, power, and action. The second section, Recommendations for Praxis for Writing Support and Writing Instructors, provides evidence-based guidelines for writing centre staff, instructors, administrators, and researchers. Thus, this statement serves not only as an explanation of principles but also as a heuristic for more justice-centred practices.

Concepts of Belonging, Identity, Citational Justice, and Accessibility

1. Language is inherently connected to action and to power.

Slavery, discrimination, racist government policies and practices, and colonial genocide have a long history in what is now called Canada. Language has been used as a tool of violence, death, and genocide and has justified many atrocities within what is now called Canada, such as residential schools, slavery, Chinese Head Tax, Japanese Internment, Komagata Maru incident, and anti-immigration policies. Resistance has come in the form of narratives and voices from these communities that need more space in writing classrooms and support environments.

2. Languaging is inherently connected to our identities and cultures.

We use language to index our values, identities, and community memberships (e.g., racial, ethnic, linguistic, professional, and other sociocultural identities and relations). But

beyond spoken word or alphabetic text, we make meaning and perform our identities through our bodies (e.g., sign language, gesture, movement, eye gaze) and other symbolic and performative resources (e.g., clothing, hair, makeup). Also importantly, because we use our language to construct, negotiate, and make sense of meaning, identities, and power, language is also embodied *action* – we *do* things through and with language. For instance, marching, as in protest, does not begin until someone communicates (through their walking, chanting, and holding the placard or other signs), followed by uptake by others. In other words, composing takes on many forms and is not simply restricted to writing.

In what is now called Canada, language use in postsecondary contexts is often indexed as white front-facing, meaning that those who identify as white expect institutions to reflect their understanding of language. In order for marginalized and colonized student populations to be comfortable in academic spaces, they need to see themselves represented in their instructors, leaders, scholarship, citational practice, course materials, and writing centre staff.

3. Language-in-use (or Discourse) involves negotiation, often within asymmetrical power relations.

Language is tied to who is doing language and what that doing means given the sociocultural, political, and historical context. We often change the way we use language, depending on the situation, including, but not limited to, who we are talking to, what relation we have with that person, what we want to accomplish, and how we want to come across. In other words, the rhetorical situation informs such negotiation, which is shaped by the power dynamics of those involved and the larger power structure. Those with less perceived social and cultural power and/or privilege may be expected to defer to the norms of more privileged groups.

Language use in postsecondary contexts often privileges, and even requires, normalized whiteness, and many students must compromise their voices, and even their ways of knowing, in these asymmetrical power relations. It is crucial that students be able to use their voices and tell their stories, and this requires those in positions of power to support students use their own voices.

4. Language is alive and always changing.

This means language is fluid and heterogeneous with multiple norms and is always shaped by the particular historical and political context. The use of *they* as a singular pronoun has increased in recent years in large part because nonbinary and trans people have fought for this usage in contexts of social power. Now, *they* as a singular pronoun is recognized by the OED, the Government of Canada and many provincial governments. We, as language

users, take up, experiment with, and change language through our daily use, yet the power of standardization still remains as a dominant force, guiding and shaping how language use is perceived and evaluated.

However, institutional structure makes change difficult, and when it does happen, it happens slowly. Writing centre staff, instructors, and administrators must continue to advocate for change and continue to push for rethinking and reassessing our language-use, our curricular requirements, our assessments, and how these forms of language use can not only better reflect the historical contexts, but also change the historical contexts in which we find ourselves. To do this important work, writing centre staff and instructors need adequate support and security, as many people in these positions experience precarity and overwork.

5. Language is always an incomplete representation of reality.

Since the interpretation of symbols is contextual, there is no such thing as perfect representation through language, which is why there is always something "lost in translation" when working across languages, dialects, and/or registers. For this reason, consultation with marginalized and colonized populations is encouraged and in certain contexts, required.

For example, instructors and writing centre support staff might assume that Indigenous students are comfortable with standard western assessment and grading practice. However, such assessment and grading praxis is often colonial in nature, furthering the goals of SAE. Therefore, implementing alternative grading in consultation with students is key to serving marginalized and colonized student populations.

Recommendations for Praxis for Writing Support and Writing Instructors

I. Goals, Outcomes, and Expectations

A. Make explicit connections between language, (in)justice, and access. Recognize the role of language in antiracism, anti-colonialism and other anti-oppression work. Model these connections in the classroom and discuss how they affect power/privilege dynamics, especially classroom dynamics. Draw from national resources found in Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie (DW/R); the resources shared by the Canadian Writing Centre and Writing Instruction Clearinghouse (CWCWIC), and those on writing centre, English, and writing program sites nationally.
B. Promote a critical social and rhetorical view of language (as opposed to a prescriptivist, privileged, bigoted, and/or standard view) that recognizes how language varies according to the rhetorical situation, including

audience/community, purpose, genre, etc. Avoid “one-size-fits-all” conceptions of “good writing.”

C. Create classroom structures and norms that promote inclusion and support practices that work toward equity and that recognize power/privilege dynamics (e.g. transparency around assessment of student learning; involvement of students in design of projects that help them to meet outcomes; ideally negotiation with students around how to value varied expectations).

II. Content (topics, materials, assignments)

A. Include representation of diverse linguistic identities, communities, and everyday experiences in course materials and assignments.
B. Promote a critical view of language and power (i.e., Critical Language Awareness), including a deep understanding of the harmful role that prescriptivism/standard language ideology can play at school and in society.
C. Adopt a broad view of literacy that includes visual, multimodal, embodied, and other non-alphabetic ways of knowing.
D. Teach and encourage use of rhetorical text/social (reading/listening) engagement skills, with close attention to inclusion/exclusion and other power dynamics.
E. Create and sustain opportunities for students to draw on their full linguistic repertoires, including a range of varieties/dialects, codes, styles, and modalities, including those that have historically been stigmatized/marginalized in the academy. This includes opportunities for code-meshing/translanguaging.
F. Design assignments that encourage students to make informed linguistic choices and to take rhetorical risks. Pair these assignments with evaluative practices that privilege these decisions.
G. Be transparent about the assumptions and expectations for course activities and assignments, using accessible language and examples.

III. Feedback, Grading, and Assessment

A. Align feedback/grading practices with a commitment to linguistic and social justice (i.e., recognize that simply changing course content is not enough).
B. Prioritize equity through transparency in rubrics, labour-based/accessible grading, and other similar assessment tools and practices.
C. Recognize that feedback is relational and not (just) transactional and use feedback to strengthen relationships with and among students, and to promote peer engagement and self-assessment among writers.

D. Orient feedback/assessment practices in a commitment to student agency, cultural rhetorical sovereignty, and growth, rather than a deficiency model—especially when it comes to students from linguistically marginalized backgrounds.

Programmatic and Institutional Actions

I. Programmatic Decisions

A. Bring a critical lens, informed by the core concepts outlined above, to programmatic and institutional conversations about professional standards, accreditation, course evaluations, and learning outcomes.
B. Invite students from a variety of backgrounds into the process of crafting language-related policies, curricula, and assessment decisions so as to better meet student needs and goals.
C. Promote cocurricular and extracurricular opportunities that integrate and draw on linguistic diversity and cultivate critical language awareness for the entire academic community.

II. Institutional Policies and Resources

A. For programs/institutions that offer special course sections, policies, or resources for multilingual (and/or multidialectal) writers: Make sure these offerings are asset-based and integrative, rather than remedial or punitive in nature.
B. Design faculty development and outreach initiatives that promote critical engagement with linguistic diversity, tied to other institutional commitments to UNDRIP, Truth and Reconciliation (TRC) antiracism, global citizenship, etc.
C. Recruit, support, and retain faculty, staff, and administrators from diverse linguistic/dialectical/cultural backgrounds, and use evaluation and promotion criteria and procedures that value linguistic justice and equity work.
D. Gather feedback and other data about the experiences, needs, and goals of students and faculty/staff from linguistically marginalized backgrounds, in order to inform decision making.
E. Practice accessible and inclusive language use in the classroom, across the campus, and in the larger community.
F. Offer resources and incentives for faculty/staff engagement in language learning and professional development opportunities (e.g., anti-oppression workshops).

Scholarship: Take active steps to make scholarship more accessible.

A. Model inclusive, accessible language with students, colleagues, and community members.

B. Seek out publication venues that are publicly available (e.g., open-access journals, institutional repositories) where possible.
C. Advocate for valuing a variety of publication types in review and promotion, including grey literature (such as syllabi, internal poster presentations, course redesign materials, multimodal work, public and popular genres)
D. Recognize and reward community-based, multilingual, multimodal, and multidialectal scholarship.
E. Promote linguistic equity in scholarly editing and peer review practices.

Notes

1. We would like to acknowledge and bring attention to the work of scholars who have come before us. Please see the work shared through CASDW, DW/R, CWCA/ACCR. We would like to thank SSHRC and all the participants and interviewees for contributing their wisdom and resources.
2. See, for example, Section 5.6 in *Why Write: A Guide for Students in Canada*, the University of Victoria's Transgender Archive, and the Government of Canada's guidelines for inclusive language use.

Acknowledgments

We have drawn from the open access position statement on Language, Power and Action published by the Conference on College Communication and Composition. We revised the statement to better reflect the context of what is now called Canada and include knowledge based on the workshop interviews, discussions and materials. We are indebted to the work of the task force responsible for the Language, Power and Action Statement. The members of this task force included: Yavanna Brownlee, Eunjeong Lee, Ana Milena, Ribero, Shawna Shapiro, and Soha Youssef.

CONCLUSION

Because writing instruction and support is so diffusely spread across what is now called Canada, future research needs to focus on building research capacity and investing in greater access to research. The field is in jeopardy. Collecting and sharing teaching materials (see Table 1 and Appendix F) is a stop gap measure. What's needed is research infrastructure funded by federal and provincial funding agencies that enhance and add venues for research dissemination (such as adding writing studies to the list of fields in SSHRC funding applications). Participants and interviewees mentioned at least two major SSHRC grants applications that will be submitted in 2024 and 2025. These grants are focused on "desiloing" writing studies and making more connections across

postsecondary institutions. These projects along with this open-access report and anti-oppressive research and teaching materials are part an exciting expansion in the field nationally (akin to the 1979 Dartmouth Conference that produced foundational work in writing studies or rhetoric and composition internationally). Finally, the future of the field seems to depend on developing and curating writing studies cyberspace or interconnected networks that create the kinds of communities of practice needed to make real and lasting change for students. Much like other crucial academic digital networks, such as the WAC Clearinghouse in the U.S., our site will share teaching and research resources to alleviate workload; disseminate research findings (that can support marginalized and colonized student populations); and offer the kind of discursive spaces that invigorate, empower, and uplift.

KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION ACTIVITIES

First, we have secured an open-access site supported by the University of Victoria Libraries (with special thanks to Librarian, Inba Kehoe) where we will publish the majority of the 72 teaching and learning resources participants and interviewees so generously shared with us. The guiding philosophy of this site is: If we support marginalized and colonized students, then we support all students. This site and this report were created to serve the following audiences:

Audience 1: Postsecondary Educators, Writing Centre Staff and Administrators – Our primary audiences are those teaching writing, supporting writing, and using writing in the classroom as a means of assessment as well as those who influence policy about writing assessment. Educators face challenges in the classroom in terms of Academic Integrity, student privacy issues (with the use of third-party AI applications used for grading, writing, and editing), and teaching the habits of mind that lead to student success. These professionals need access to knowledge that can inform local praxes. The workshops and resulting knowledge production – including this report, research resources, and teaching materials – provide educators with clear **strategies** based on wise practices to support equity deserving students in classrooms and writing centres nationally

Audience 2: Researchers (Graduate, Post-Doctoral, tenure track, and tenured) – Those who communicate their research via writing are also impacted by writing instruction and support standards and practices. Because researchers produce knowledge that shapes and is shaped by norms in academic writing, it is crucial that there are clear guidelines and resources that researchers can draw in when communicating their research, no matter the discipline.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andersson, G. (2018). Internet interventions: Past, present and future. *Internet Interventions*, *12*, 181-188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2018.03.008

Arico, A. III (2011). *The effect of class size on inclusion student academic success* (Publication No. 3473576) [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Bailey, M. (2020). *Misogynoir transformed: Black women's digital resistance.* New York University Press.

Banks, A. J. (2006). *Race, rhetoric, and technology: Searching for higher ground*. Routledge.

Brinkmann, S. (2022). *Qualitative Interviewing: Conversational Knowledge Through Research Interviews* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197648186.001.0001

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives.* University of California Press.

Butler, M. A. & Larson, R. L. (1974). Students' right to their own language*. College Composition and Communication, 25*(3), 1–32.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Centre for Community Health and Development. (n.d.). Chapter 12., Section 4. Conducting a workshop. In *Community Tool Box: Learn a Skill*. University of Kansas. Retrieved December 13, 2023, from https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/structure/training-and-technical-assistance/workshops/main

Chariandy, D. J. (2007). "The fiction of belonging": On second-generation Black writing in Canada. *Callaloo*, *30*(3), 818-829. https://doi.org/10.1353/cal.2008.0022

Clary-Lemon, J. (2009). The racialization of composition studies: Scholarly rhetoric of race since 1990. *College Composition & Communication*, *61*(2), W1–W17.

Connelly, A., Pagano, S., Rogers, B., & Mulvaney, T. (2022). Sense of belonging in higher education: Developing and measuring a sense of belonging across student

programs. In A. El-Amin (Ed.), *Implementing diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging in educational management practices* (pp. 52–76). IGI-Global.

Dilger, B. J., & Rice, J. (Eds.). (2010). *From A to A: Keywords of markup*. University of Minnesota Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (2018). *The Souls of Black Folk.* Myers Education Press. (Original work published 1903)

Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1984). Audience addressed/audience invoked: The role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, *35*(2), 155–171. https://doi.org/10.2307/358093

Eyman, D. (2015). *Digital rhetoric: Theory, method, practice*. University of Michigan Press.

Ferreira, L., Manià, K., Fitzpatrick, K., Richards, K., & Lee, T. (2024). *Anti-racist toolkit for the teaching of writing.* Retrieved March 16, 2025, from https://blogs.ubc.ca/antiracisttoolkit

Glenn, C. (1997). *Rhetoric retold: Regendering the tradition from antiquity through the Renaissance*. Southern Illinois University Press.
All the women are White, all the Blacks are men, but some of us are brave: Black women's studie
Grande, S. (2018). Refusing the university. In E. Tuck & K.W. Yang (Eds.), *Toward what justice? Describing diverse dreams of justice in education* (pp. 47–65). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351240932-4

Grayson, J. P., Côté, J., Chen, L., Kenedy, R., & Roberts, S. (2019). *Academic skills deficiencies in four Ontario universities: A call to action*. York University. Retrieved March 16, 2025, from https://skillsforuniversitysuccess.info.yorku.ca/files/2019/04/04-26-2019-AcademicSkills.pdf?x38316

Hillocks, G. (1984). What works in teaching composition: A meta-analysis of experimental treatment studies. *American Journal of Education, 93*(1), 133–170. https://doi.org/10.1086/443789

Horning, A. (2007). The definitive article on class size. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 31*(1–2), 11–34.

Hull, A. G., Bell-Scott, P., & Smith, B. (1982). *s*. Feminist Press.

Humphreys, S., Collins, J., & Gaudet, L. (2024). *Writing and power: Positions and policies for social change – Call for participants*. Retrieved March 16, 2025, from https://accute.ca/2024/07/08/cfp-writing-power-positions-and-policies-for-social-change/

Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0698

Inoue, A. B., & Poe, M. (2020). How to stop harming students: An ecological guide to antiracist writing assessment. *Composition Studies, 48*(3), 14–163.

Isaacs, E. J. (2017). *Writing at the state U: Instruction and administration at 106 comprehensive universities*. Utah State University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge.

Joudrey. S. (2020, Nov. 23). *Trauma informed pedagogy: What it is and how it can help now*. Focus on University Teaching & Learning. Retrieved March 16, 2025, from https://focus.clt.dal.ca/blog/trauma-informed-pedagogy-what-it-is-and-how-it-can-help-now

MacLeod, L. (2021). More than personal communication: Templates for citing Indigenous Elders and Knowledge Keepers. *KULA: Knowledge Creation, Dissemination, and Preservation Studies 5*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.18357/kula.135

Mann, S. (2016). *The research interview: Reflective practice and reflexivity in research processes*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137353368

Marshall, N. A., Park, S. E., Adger, W. N., Brown, K., & Howden, S. M. (2012). Transformational capacity and the influence of place and identity. *Environmental Research Letters*, *7*(3), 034022. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/3/034022

Marshall, S., Zhou, M., Gervan, T., & Wiebe, S. (2012). Sense of belonging and first-year academic literacy. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 42*(3), 116–142. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v42i3.2044

Miller, L., & Olson, J. (1994). Putting the computer in its place: A study of teaching with technology. *Journal of curriculum studies*, *26*(2), 121–141.

MIT Teaching + Learning Lab. (2023). *Students' sense of belonging matters: Evidence from three studies*. MIT Teaching and Learning Lab Blog. https://tll.mit.edu/sense-of-belonging-matters/

Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. Teachers College Press.

Phelps, L. W. (2014). The historical formation of academic identities: Rhetoric and composition, discourse and writing. *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, *25*(1). https://doi.org/10.31468/cjsdwr.37

Phillips, C., & Ahrenhoerster, G. (2018). Class size and first-year writing: Exploring the effects on pedagogy and student perception of writing process. *Teaching English in the Two Year College, 46*(1), 9–29.

Ørngreen, R., & Levinsen, K. (2017). Workshops as a research methodology. *The Electronic Journal of eLearning 15*(1), 70–81. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1140102

Park, J. (2023). Agency, identity, and writing: Perspectives from first-generation students of color in their first year of college. *Research in the Teaching of English, 57*(3), 227–247. https://doi.org/10.58680/rte202332353

Peterson, S. S., & McClay, J. K. (2012). Assumptions and practices in using digital technologies to teach writing in middle-level classrooms across Canada. *Literacy*, *46*(3), 140–146.

Ridolfo, J. (2015). *Digital Samaritans: Rhetorical delivery and engagement in the digital humanities*. University of Michigan Press.

Schell, E. E., & Stock, P. L. (Eds.) (2001). *Moving a mountain: Transforming the role of contingent faculty in composition studies and higher education*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Todd, Z. (2016). An Indigenous feminist's take on the ontological turn: 'Ontology' is just another word for colonialism. *Journal of Historical Sociology, 29*(1), 4–22.

Walcott, R. (2003). *Black like who?: Writing Black Canada*. Insomniac Press.

Warner, J. (2018). *Why they can't write: Killing the five-paragraph essay and other necessities*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Watson, M. (2018). Contesting standardized English. *Academe, 104*(3). https://www.aaup.org/article/contesting-standardized-english

Weick, K. E. (1998). Introductory essay: Improvisation as a mindset for organizational analysis. *Organization Science*, *9*(5), 543–555. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.9.5.543

Yusoff, R. B. M., Khan, A., Rasheed, M. F., & Aamir, A. (2014). Effects of social support on faculty workload and performance. *Review of European Studies*, *6*(2), 95–103. https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v6n2p95

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Post-Secondary Writing and Citational Justice

Panel Interview with Brian Hotson, Writing Centre Specialist; Christian Isbister (Métis), Indigenous Initiatives Librarian (UBC-O); Lorisia McLeod, Second Generation Indigenous Librarian (James Smith Cree Nation) (The Alberta Library); [Redacted]; Dr. Katja Thieme, Associate Teaching Professor Journalism, Writing, and Media (UBC)

Facilitated by Dr. Jason Collins (UVic) and Dr. Loren Gaudet (UVic)

September 24th, 2024

Interview Questions

- What does it mean to practice citational justice?
- In your opinion, is there a difference in the roles of individual academics/students, institutional policies, and institutional staff in citational justice?
- What do you see as the major challenges in teaching citational justice to undergraduate or graduate students?
- If you had the opportunity to give advice to any writing instructor or writing centre staff (or any other writing practitioner), what might you say?
- What do you think makes Citational Justice in what is now called Canada unique? What are the issues that students and scholars in what is now called Canada deal with?
- We are going to draft a position statement on Citational Justice in what is now called Canada. What do you think is crucial information to include in such a position statement?

Transcript

Facilitator 1 (Dr. Jason Collins): So, our first question – and again feel free to answer or raise your hand if you have something to contribute. If you don't, no pressure – but our first question, in terms of citational justice, is what does it mean to practice citation justice? What does it look? Maybe in the classroom, in our research… your experience with citational justice. So, any one of our interviewees that would like to speak on that, if yu could raise your hand, we'll call on you. okay. I see [redacted] has a hand up.

[redacted]: I can start. Can you all hear me okay? The obligatory Zoom question. Thank you. Before I get into the answer to that question,

[*Section redacted to protect the identity of the interviewee*].

And so that's a little bit about me and I'm so excited to be here today.

We had the invitation from Jason to speak very much in "I" terms. So I thought, this is a question that I can answer very much within my own experience, and this connects directly to the work that Lorisia McLeod has done with developing templates for citing Indigenous knowledge and elders.

[*Section redacted to protect the identity of the interviewee.*]

And then Lorisia's work came along. It felt right, right? Like, it felt like I was able to do the thing correctly and respectfully, and I was so grateful to Lorisia for the work that she had done on that in order to give a pathway to that. So, I think for me, it's really about respecting those relationships that exist between authors and knowledge keepers and elders, and, just, people, really, in a way that allows us to bring in those voices in a way that demonstrates that respect in a similar way to how we treat all other authors. And so, I raise my hands to Lorisia in gratitude for that.

Facilitator 1: Thank you so much. Anyone else that would like to speak to what does it mean to practice this citational justice? Oh, I see, I see your hand, Katja. Please.

Dr. Katja Thieme: Thank you. Thank you. I didn't want to just barge in. So, I'm Katja. I'm on Musqueam territory here as an uninvited guest. Thank you, [redacted], for getting our responses started in such an amazing way. I wanted to kind of just fan out the range of thoughts in my head when I think of citational justice. So, one has to do with the selections I make, to stay with "I" statements, when I put course lists together, for instance. It has to do with my relationships with students that I build. Trying to understand and know their own positionality and support them in their own search for voices and sources and topics in an intersectional way.

One, two, three points in my head. Of course, my own work and being aware and noticing gaps always in my own practices of citation.

Another point has to do with the particular direction of my work. I do a number of corpus-based analyses. I'm really interested in the range of writing practices across disciplines, and there is really a lot of quantitative and qualitative work that highlights for us how uneven practices of citation are – how people are systematically excluded from research

practices, from their work being heard by being cited, and how that is tied to their identities in very intersectional ways.

And my particular focus, over the last few years, which has been in collaboration with my colleague Mary Ann Saunders on Trans Writing Studies, and kind of analysis of practices of inclusion and separation of trans knowledge and trans experience in research in particular. That's been our focus. So, I'll stop there. That's sort of kind of immediately the fanning of issues – to give just a little... a little summary.

Facilitator 1: Wonderful. Thank you so much. Yeah, Christian? I see your hand.

Christian Isbister: I'll go next. So, I'll start with the personal introduction, and say hi everyone. My name is Christian Isbister. You got that last name right, Jason. I'm a Métis librarian. I work at UBC Okanagan campus, so I'm sort of Katja's cousin down in the Okanagan. So, this is traditional and unceded Syilx Okanagan territory. I, like I said, I'm a Métis librarian. I have mixed Métis and Ukrainian ancestry, and my father's side is from treaty 6 [territory] in Saskatchewan. So right around Saskatoon. And then a mix of Dutch and Irish from my mom's side around treaty 4 [territory] in Saskatchewan. I grew up in Red Deer, Alberta, which is right on the borders of treaty 6 and 7. I've lived in Edmonton, or *amiskwaciwâskahikan*, which is firmly located within that treaty 6 territory. And I've been here for the past three years.

So many great things have been mentioned already, and so when I think about the work that I do in relation to citation justice, I'm thinking, often of the support that I offer to students. And I think so often when I'm chatting with students they're showing up in a rush and they need, you know, just two articles for an assignment that is maybe due the next day, and so lots of the work that I can do is to kind of try and push back against that a little bit and encourage folks to think critically about the kinds of sources that they're bringing in. How can they be in good relationship with knowledge? Lots of times when I'm talking about citations, which can feel really dry and boring and fiddly, I'm thinking about citations as one of the only ways that we practice and demonstrate relationality in academia, that we can formalize those relationships. And so making sure that we're engaging in those relationships in a good way is how I see this. I'll no doubt expand on that later. So maybe, I'll leave it there for now.

Facilitator 1: Thanks so much, Christian. Brian, I see you have a hand up.

Brian Hotson: Hello everybody. I'm um... let me lower my hand here. I'm meeting you from the... from my lawn, obviously. Yeah, I would like to acknowledge that I'm coming to you from Mi'kma'ki, which is the unceded land of the Mi'kmaq people and also want to recognize that Nova Scotia was the last jurisdiction in Canada to enslave human beings.

So I think that's also important to point out. And those human beings were African who were stolen from their lands.

Thank you for inviting me to this session today. I really appreciate it. I'm no longer at Dalhousie. I was at Dalhousie, but my contract ended, and so I am now floating about in the ether, literally and figuratively. In terms of social justice for citation, I concur with what everyone was saying here. For me, it's also about sharing. So with my own work, I like to make sure that I... that all my bibliographies are public to everyone who would like to look at them. And as a white settler who works in decoloniality and social justice work, especially around the colonization of knowledge, I spend a great deal of time looking at the sources of my sources. So, you know, if I'm reading, for example, Magnolo, I'll give that as an example, he speaks about delinking, well, this actually goes back to Samir Amin, who is a Marxist philosopher, an Egyptian philosopher, who wrote about delinking first, and so I think it's important for me to go back to see who... [and] where these ideas come from and to make sure that those are known in my own writing. And also, the last thing I'll mention too is to challenge, folks, when it is appropriate for me as a white settler to do so, and to challenge folks to do the digging and go back and not to simply use those popular sources for their own citation and in their work and as a reviewer for journal articles and so on to use that opportunity to introduce writers and scholars to, you know, to these writers who may not necessarily be known in Western audiences. So. Thank you.

Faciliator 1: Thanks so much, Brian. Yeah. Lorisia? I see your hand.

Lorisia McLeod: Yeah. So first of all, [redacted], thank you for the slight early introduction you gave of me and my work and your kind introduction at that. My name is Lorisia McLeod. I am a member of the James Smith Cree Nation, and I was born and raised in Edmonton, Alberta. I currently work for the Alberta Library, which is a not-for-profit library consortium. So, we serve libraries, not the public or academics. But I have previous experience working in academic libraries of varying sizes. I... my nation is actually in what's now known as Saskatchewan, so I was born and raised downriver from that. And that was actually a part of what kind of led to me being invested in the role that libraries play in terms of my own access to my knowledge, as somebody who was born and raised away from community. I'm a third-generation library worker, second generation Cree librarian. My dad, my sister and I are all alumnis from the same library school and work in different areas of the field. So, libraries are very near and dear to my heart. And yeah, so that's just kind of a little bit about me.

[Redacted] mentioned my work regarding templates for citing Indigenous elders and knowledge keepers. And that's, I think, a linchpin of why I'm here. But I don't want to go too far into that because, trust me, I can talk for hours on it. But I want to make sure I'm

actually going to answer the questions we have today. So, in terms of citational justice, I think for me because I didn't actually know that word, really, when I started working on challenging citational status quos, or working with elders and knowledge keepers about talking about how they would like to be represented in academia, I think, for me, I kind of focus on the breakdown of the words. To me, I'm not a legal expert, but I think of it the same way I look at the difference between law versus justice. Citational laws would be like the styles, the rules. "Do this. Don't do that." Whereas citational justice is really about a broader practice, it's the rules contextualized into reality and the practice of implementing them.

Most importantly, I would say it's continuously critically reviewing whether the laws are still appropriate for creating the system of justice, the goals we have on mass, or, if we really need to look at amending them. So I think for me that's what those words kind of meant to me. Similar to the justice system, I'd like to think that there are continuous improvement that can be made, and, similar to the justice system, I think that there are past harms that citation has been involved in and academia has been involved in that we cannot, nor should we forget – and may or may not even be able to redress. But we can use them to inform a better tomorrow. And that's what citational justice really boils down to [for] me is looking ahead for a better future, a better justice system. A more fair and appropriate way forward for us all.

Facilitator 1: Thank you. Thank you so much. Thank you to all the panelists for helping us understand, like, what is this thing we're talking about? Citation justice. So, our next question will come from Loren Gaudet.

Facilitator 2: (Dr. Loren Gaudet): And I think that... I mean, thank you so much. You guys are all so insightful, but I think Lorisia leaving us with that metaphor gives us... It's just such a nice bridge to the next question because obviously in this kind of, like, law versus justice system, different roles are played by different people and different people have different abilities to make interventions. So, kind of building on that in your... in all of your opinions, is there a difference in the roles of individual academics and students, institutional policies and institutional staff in citational justice? In other words, like, yeah, how do we manage these kind of different responsibilities if there are any, and what are those? And I'll put that in the chat as well. [redacted]?

[redacted]: I don't know if you wanted us to go in the same order or not, but...

Facilitator 2: Oh no. Whoever feels particularly motivated.

[redacted]: Okay. I can... I don't want to take up space, if someone else might want to jump in with... I'm looking at the other panelists to see if anyone else wants to start. Okay.

Facilitator 2: Go for it. Thank you.

[redacted]: Okay. My experience has been that there are significant differences in the roles simply because of the glacial pace of change at the institutional level. And that if we wait for institutions to enact change first, and then individuals follow through beyond that, we could wait forever. I think there are opportunities for individuals, students, to look at it from the point of view of "what about my immediate status quo can I change?" and start affecting small change and, in effect, those small changes can encourage those larger changes. You know, and I'm.... And that is... And I'm speaking again from experience on this, that this is what I've been trying do particularly and also in, you know, what the writing centre's been trying to do, is really looking at in our day-to-day, what can we change in terms of how we are engaging in those relationships? So that as that institutional change comes, we're kind of aligned with that change, but not waiting for it.

Now, I think there's some... I wanna recognize there's some challenges in that. So for example, it would be very challenging for staff whose jobs aren't protected to come out against institutional policies, right? So there's... there can be attention there. Faculty can have academic freedom. Staff may not. I know I don't. So, you know, I have to be mindful in what I'm doing and how we position what we're saying, and what actions we're taking to like, fall within those institutional policies. But I think often times there are places that we can all push a little bit or a lot. And I think students can run up against power imbalances with instructors where, you know, instructors want APA and only APA or whatever the system is or, you know, only peer-reviewed materials that have gone through Western publishing system and therefore aren't interested in other types of knowledge. And that's really. That's hard for students because if they want to push against that and the instructor says no, where do you... where do you go from there as a student, right? That's really hard. So, I think there are definitely differences in those roles, but I'm...

You know, one of the things that we're trying to do in the writing centre is to, if students want to have those kinds of conversations around "I want to bring in traditional knowledge into my work. How can I do that in a way that is going to satisfy my instructor's expectations?" is to try and give them some tools to perhaps have that conversation or to point out, you know, things like the citation template that show how to approach that information in a way such that it can be positioned in the same way as you know, typical peer review. To have conversations about "isn't traditional knowledge peer reviewed by its very nature? So maybe can we start thinking about what peer review means in a way that expands beyond kind of that very Western colonial definition of it?" Just to give students some more tools so that when they go to have those conversations with their instructors, they're more equipped to have that conversation to be able to advocate for themselves.

Facilitator 2: Yes. Absolutely. Thank you, [redacted]. Lorisia: your turn.

McLeod: Excellent. [redacted], I think you hit a lot of the same points that I was going to mention. So I'll try not to repeat, but a lot of it I can easily just say like plus one to what [redacted] said.

I think that what I've seen is that there are going to be individuals who push against status quos because they see knowledges that they're familiar with or identities that they're familiar with not being represented in ways that they view as appropriate in academia. And I think that's excellent and fantastic. Unfortunately, this means the emotional labour of a lot of this citational justice rests on, a lot of the time, minority identity people. And there is a lot of weight to that kind of work. So, I would like to see there be a more active role that institutions take in recognizing that, and recognizing the toll that can take, particularly when, at the same time, they might have policies where they say as an institution, we support diversifying academia or we want to welcome different voices. I think there is a difference between just welcoming someone in and making sure that they have a place to sit. And so, looking at what policies need to be in place to empower those individuals, to create constructive communication filters where, you know [redacted], I think you really hit the nail on the head in terms of the difficulty with some of the pace that these institutions can change. I don't necessarily think it's wrong, so long as the individuals involved in trying to create this change feel like they are making progress and feel like they understand how to change the direction of this massive boat of an institution, or that they understand the pace to expect. And I don't think a lot of that is very clearly explained to people when they're involved in the academic machine.

So, I don't have an answer for how exactly that could look like, because it's just more like a theoretical conceptual idea. However, I can say, you know, I'd really like to see, as you mentioned, staff who have additional protections maybe be involved in taking on some of that emotional labour or having those protections extended to people who are expected to take on complex matters like citational justice. It's hard to tell an institution “Hey, I think you're wrong” or “I think there's a better way to do this,” if you don't have intergenerational wealth to fall back on and you don't have long-term job protections.

Additionally, on a more individual level, I definitely would like to see academia foster… I used to be a musical kid, so, my brain immediately goes to like the adlib “yes and” sort of perspective where when you hear someone's idea, if it doesn't quite match with yours, that doesn't necessarily make it wrong. Instead, approaching other people's ideas with this “Oh yes, that's interesting. And I wonder how it could apply to my own perspectives or my own area of expertise” and wanting to work together. I don't blame the fact that I feel like the capitalist ideal of, you know, “who's better” has crept into academia, but I would like to

see that change. Because I really think when we work together, when we bring a lot of perspectives to bear, that's when we get the best possible product and change.

Yeah. So I would love to see clear policies, protection of intellectual property of employees, hiring practices that align with playing... paying people for additional emotional labor expectations and those clearly noted in job expectations and tenure packages. You know, if you want to be a leading institution in academic or citational justice, your staff are going to make some potentially uncomfortable recommendations. They might say we should not allow students for one year to use any citational style at all. They have to come up with it themselves to make them really think about what matters to me in citation. There could be some just wild ideas that might seem like, oh gosh, what did we do? But if you really want to be a world leader, if you really want to create change, you have to be open to hearing ideas that completely shatter the status quo. You might not implement them exactly as recommended – that might be an open discussion – but at least hearing them and critically engaging with, “could we do that? What could we do that like? What's the pedagogical reason behind that, and does it support our values?”

So institutions looking more at the big picture as they should... as the big as the big institution, they should look big picture. So questioning themselves in terms of retention, who gets tenure and how. Is there an expectation of citational justice in people's work before they can get tenure? Are there ways to encourage the intake of critique of ideas like citation that would allow their institution to become like a world leader in developing these changes. Those would require coming up with some other ways of doing stuff. So they're going to be uncomfortable conversations, but I can't imagine how cool the outcomes could look like and who might be at that table that might be voices that we traditionally have not gotten to see at high levels of empowerment in institutions like academia. So... Yeah, I guess that's my answer. A little pie in the sky, some specifics, but, mostly pie in the sky. I hope. I wish.

Facilitator 2: Thank you. Brian, I saw you had your hand up. Would you like to go next?

Hotson: Yeah. Thank you to [redacted] and Lorisia for that. I can... I'll speak from my own experience. We cannot rely on the institution for anything from what we're talking about today. I was a senior administrator in one institution in Canada, and I've worked in three different institutions now, and the inherent racism and colonial reinforcement at the highest levels of the universities I worked at, is astounding. I was surprised sitting in committees at the points of view of senior members of staff and senior administrators, as well as senior faculty within the universities. And I can say that freely now, because I don't plan [on] working at anymore... at universities any longer.

I could regale you with stories for hours about. Specific incidents that happened that were appalling to anyone. So, we can't rely on institutions to do this work. The only people we can rely on are the folks that are here now, in this in this meeting, and the other people who are in like positions in their own institutions and the way to do that is to is to affect the change through students and through faculty members by putting pressure on administration – the last thing administration wants is bad press. And so, Lorisia, I think your pie in the sky actually could be instituted through pressure from faculty. So, I was never a faculty member, and I, as a senior administrator and writing centre director… anything that I wanted to do, I always got faculty on my side, so I called them the friends of the centre and at a very low grassroots level, I said, are you in on this? Let's do something together to get this done.

So for example, I'll give you a small example. Just a few years ago, just getting the… if you recall, the brouhaha around pronouns, remember that? Remember Fox News shutting down? I was working at the WLN blog as the editor then and somebody hacked the blog because OWL Purdue said that we should… which was connected to WLN, said that they should have pronouns. So these small things that now, you know, are… seem trivial in terms of how they are used now, these only came about from the ground up and from folks getting together at a very low level. We cannot rely on institutions to be our partners, to be our friends because they're… an institution's goal is to remain an institution, is to carry on. And… Yeah, it's, it's sad, but it's what… that's my experience I'm speaking from.

And then in terms of students, you know, for many years I ran several… for several years, 15 years, introduction to university, how to be a student [courses]. And it's in these initial meetings with students where you can lay the groundwork for them with things that Lorisia was talking about. I also did a lot of instruction with new faculty. And the thing about new faculty, when they come in, they don't know anything. About how the institution works, they don't know how systems work in the university, so they're looking for… to the senior members of the university to find out. So, you just say, "Here's how things work." And you eventually find, I found over the years, that then that's where you find the people who are you're going to work with. Those are the people who are going to, from my experience, become the "friend of the centre" – and I've had success around that.

The other folks that can help with this kind of justice work are the student government, because many a time… the example I'll give you is the pronoun document that we produced, produced the document at the writing centre, it was a Teaching and Learning Centre committee, it was the English department, and it was the student union. So, I got in touch with the student union and the president, and they put their stamp on it as well. So the force… university administration does not want to make an enemy of the students. And

so those kinds of pressures are just an example of other – and there's other things I could talk about, but I want to use this one example – that's where the justice and that's where it works, you know? And I'm a student of Edward Soja, and the idea of spatiality, and spatial justice. And one of their ideas was that all space is political, as we know, all space is constructed, and all space comes with its politics a priori, it's already constructed when we enter into it. So we as scholars as writing centre tutors and administrators and as faculty members, when we enter into these spaces, we have to consider everyone who's there and bring them all together. So from my perspective, my one skill that I have is bringing people together, and so I've been able to do that, and that's when things have gotten done. Thank you.

Facilitator 2: Thank you, Brian. Fantastic. Katja, would you like to speak to this? Thanks.

Thieme: Thank you. Thank you to the three of you who have spoken before me. We've covered such an incredible amount of ground in the issues for my own memory sake, I just want to highlight, I appreciate the discussion on academic freedom and how it is very unevenly distributed among workers in the university. The question of precarity that plays into it and job security, the question of, like, on the one hand, individually, we want instructors and staff and tutors to be doing to be pushing citational justice to be thinking about citational justice, but not everyone will do that. And so, there's then also a question of students who have been thinking in those terms and wish to instantiate that in their work, running kind of into friction with some of their instructors. I appreciate that scenario being brought up and the advocacy that students – and agency – that students need in those situations. And, I wanted to add to Brian's emphasis on, kind of, the dynamics of administrations of university administrations. What came to my mind when I read the question around institutional responsibilities and institutional policies is, like as a genre, I think immediately that institutional policies are genres that are produced through processes and these processes also involve citation. However, they are documents that don't put their citational practices on their sleeves, and it's behind the scenes, it's untraceable in some ways.

And the reason why that kind of way of thinking was so prominent for me is that, just last week, I was part of a meeting where we discussed how at UBC there is a very active advocacy group around disability justice, and it's very… it's grassroots. And this group has been producing documents, has been sending letters to the administration, has been putting pressure, has been… Has offered, like, detailed suggestions and criticisms of existing policies, has modelled how to rethink existing practices to the lines of disability justice, and has experienced – gained some profile in that work – but has experienced a number of, like, slights in this… in the interaction with administration. And they're so much

about citation, so that's why I'm mentioning them. So, these documents are received by the administration. There is, kind of, a meeting that might happen, but then it's unclear where that impetus goes, where that energy goes, what the response is to the specific criticisms being raised. And then, when an administration puts together some sort of task force, some sort of committee, and does not include members of the advocacy group that has brought the issue to the foreground, that is also an aspect of citational injustice. And just kind of... it was like the meeting kind of detailed a number of these steps that we can think of as practices of citation: how knowledge of others, how criticism, how critique that has names and people attached to it as speakers gets taken up in somewhat underhanded ways and channelled in the interests of those with decision-making power. So, I think it's really, really complex to think of citational justice when we think these different roles and positions together and these institutional dynamics and structures of power.

Facilitator 2: Thank you. So, I am keeping one eye on the time, and so one thing I would just like to do... I'm going to put a link in the chat here. And this will take you to – it's a long link, sorry. This will take you to a blank document called “additional thoughts.” And so I invite anyone in the workshop, including our panellists and our participants, if you have comments, questions, additional ideas, please take time now or after and dump all of your ideas in there. And in the interest of time, thank you all of you guys for your fantastic comments on that. And the other thing is, I feel like there's so many tie-ins to our other workshop themes. So I just want to quickly plug [that] on October 15th, we're having a workshop specifically on working conditions, and I would love to continue this conversation there because I mean, these things are all together. But, to keep us moving along, I'm going to pass it over to Jason with another question for our panelists.

Facilitator 1: Thanks, Loren. Yeah. So I've I think there's been this theme, from our panellists, about challenges we face, like, at the institutional level – of all kinds, right? But we're also wondering, if we're trying to implement and teach and work with citational justice with students, whether it's inside the classroom or outside of the classroom, what kinds of challenges have you encountered? Or have you thought of that might come up when working with students and citational justice? Yeah, Christian?

Isbister: What a great question. I'm going to cheat a little bit, and I'm going to complain about faculty really quickly. But I see sort of two challenges in here. The first is that the times that I get to talk about citation justice the most are when I get invited into classes, and to get invited into classes the faculty needs to invite me into their class, And so, I kinda joke that I can go rogue maybe once, and if I do that and the faculty is not on board, then I just don't get invited again. And so, I think it's really important... like, that one of the roles that I see in a relatively smaller institution like the [UBC] Okanagan campus is to build good

relationships with faculty members so that they invite me in, and they're open to these conversations. I was really excited I got to go to a TA introduction, sort of lecture series, and I talked about citation justice there, and so I think there's opportunities to kind of work there. But getting faculty on board is the first challenge.

The second challenge that I'll mention really quickly is combating what I see as, like, a perceived lack of agency among students. And I want to be very clear that that is through no fault of the students themselves, but like I think back when I was an undergraduate, I felt like it was tacitly encouraged that I just keep my head down, that I find my three articles, and that I move on. And then once I'm much higher up in the institution, I'm allowed to have, like, thoughts and opinions and ideas on these things. And so, one of the things I try and really get at when I go into classes is to encourage students to think about their own agency, their own responsibility in the kinds of things that they're pulling from, right? The fact that if they care about – a common example is Indigenous identity – so, if you care about including self-identified Indigenous folks in their reference list, then that has a tangible impact on the work that gets done on campus. So yeah, maybe. I'll leave it there for now.

Facilitator 1: Wonderful. Thank you. Thanks so much. Anyone else have thoughts on this? Like challenges working... Yeah, Katja. I see your hand.

Thieme: Those are such great, great points, Christian. I'm always tempted to ask you like which discipline/faculties are most amenable to... but I'm just posting the question. You don't need to answer. So, because I'm going to bring up disciplinarity and disciplinary differences – it's my hobby horse. I teach one version of our research writing course to students in applied science and science. It is so fun. So, I don't even want to say the word challenge in that regard. But, there are tensions with the way their minds are disciplined in their fields around a kind of neutrality of voice and detached positionality, and objective use of data and language. And... I do enjoy it so much. I get to be a little bit rogue because I'm not working in those departments, and I'm offering a service, and I can create niches for thinking, and create... like, give students the option of making use of the course in, like an academically free way. They don't have to pursue projects that are perfectly aligned with their programs. They can experiment. And they can try out a different voice and a different way of writing while I am teaching them what... how different disciplines talk and what it looks like in their field.

And so. Yeah. Where was I going with? So citational justice, I guess the challenge, the one thing that I would call a challenge in that regard is, how I would like to have more room in my schedule – like my workload puts real limitations on that. I have found that the best way to approach it with the students in those courses in particular, where they do not come

pre-trained in the same way as students in humanities and social sciences come, I think it works best in like really project-focused almost one-on-one ways to guide them in using voice in using choices of language, in shaping the material that they work with, in searching for a citationally just, or just generally, ways of pursuing their work. Yeah, so, taking this seriously as an intersectional process requires a lot of this detailed engagement and kind of… a mass-produced way of approaching it is not, is not a good way.

Facilitator 1: Awesome. Thank you so much. Yeah. I have thoughts, but I wanna keep us rolling so… [redacted], I think I saw your hand up first?

[redacted]: First of all, I would like to be a fly on the wall when Katja goes rogue. Because that sounds fun. So, can I come along please?

I think, building on what's been said, the thing that I often think about is that citational justice is something that requires more time and explanation and anchoring in a way? Like, you can't just parachute in and go "here's citational justice" and *yoink*, "I'm out," because like you have to talk about racism and colonialism and how the structures that post-secondary education are based upon are at their core racist colonial structures. And like the history of the educational system in Canada, and like that bigger picture is so enormous when you're speaking to this one thing, which of course isn't one thing, but… And then a lot of that is going to be personalized to the person you're talking to and where they are on that pathway of understanding. Because if I go to somebody and say, well, you know universities are racist, right? They're like, "whoa. What? What are you talking about?" Then I have to step back and I have to start there versus talking, you know… Or like, "publishing systems are racist, right?" "What are you talking about?" So that kind of personalization and then the investment of that time and helping people grow that understanding so that they can get to a point where they… citational justice starts to be something that they can see themselves in. I think that's a challenge.

And kind of connected to that is how busy students are. I mean and like, the thing that comes to mind when I'm thinking about this right now is, you know, how all of the conversations that we're having around generative AI and what a time saver it is for students, right? Time saver keeps coming up. Citational justice takes longer. Like it, it's… And you really have to be thoughtful about what you're doing, and Western systems of publishing, Google Scholar, like all of the ways that people find information, cite information, use information are set up for optimal efficiency, but that also then tends to prioritize the voices that are already being heard, not the voices that have been intentionally left out. And so, asking students to slow down and take the time to think about this when students are already under so much time pressure and everything else, there's a real tension there. And I have a lot of empathy for students around that – like,

that's really hard. But, like, I can speak from experience. Some colleagues and I just recently published an article, and we intentionally, because we were talking about truth and reconciliation and decolonizing online spaces, we intentionally... all of the authors in that work that we cited are Indigenous authors. And we made sure of that. That took longer, right? And oftentimes, Indigenous authors are being published in smaller presses that only print material. Like, you're not necessarily going to find it in one of these huge online databases. That takes time. So I think there's just a lot of stuff. Whereas you know APA I can go "here's how you cite an e-book." Boom and done. Those are my thoughts.

Facilitator 1: Yeah. Wonderful. Thanks so much. Yeah, I mean this theme of the labour involved is really coming through – and another shoutout, I think, to our October 15th working conditions workshop. I think these things would be really great to be able to talk through there. I want to pass it back to... I know like, we want to keep this conversation going. I see Brian and Heather's hands, but we're also almost out of time here with our interview portion. And so, I also want to remind everyone that we do have that document that Loren put into the chat. If you have thoughts, questions, additional things you want to dump into that document, feel free to throw anything you want in there. But I think Loren has one more question to ask, and I saw your hand, Brian. So, maybe we'll go to Brian? But I'll leave that up to Loren.

Facilitator 2: Brian, you can absolutely weigh in. And then the other thing is you guys have been very kindly direct messaging me, letting me know you can't actually edit the document. So... first pancake! Let us make those changes. That link will still work, and we will get on that right now. You know, Teams is a finicky, finicky little zone, so I appreciate your patience. So, Brian, why don't you weigh in and then I will throw one final question at everybody. Thank you.

Hotson: Yeah, I think the thing that I point I want to make very specific and that is that faculty, for whatever reason, they have their own citation styles and they will... some faculty will only accept certain citations styles, and I've seen students fail a course several times because they didn't cite things properly – several times. So, what I did was – speaking of science – I banded together with – this took three years – with science professors, and we created a citation handbook specifically to environmental science and geography that included student input. As well as the writing centre. And that book went through the Science Department – or Science faculty – and was approved. And so, if a student came and said something was cited improperly. It was right there on the guide.

Facilitator 2: Awesome. Thank you. So the last kind of question I wanna throw out there is to help us all kind of move forward, I suppose. You've alluded to this in terms of institutional responsibility and policies and what, as the title of this SSHRC Project kind of

alludes to, one of the things we're hoping to do here is create some policies or position statements so that institutions can do this better. So the question is, we are going to draft position statements on citational justice in what is now called Canada. What do you think is crucial information to include in such position statements, and I will take that into the chat. But I'll let you think about it, and then anyone who feels like they've got some gems of wisdom please.... Yeah. Lorisia?

McLeod: I like how, like, the hardest question is at the end and we're like, oh, right, this one. I think for me the most important aspect that I would like to see included in a draft position is the concept of citational justice as an ongoing process, not a box to check. I think for me personally coming up on the National Day of Truth and Reconciliation, that's very much in my head because of how there can be divergent ways that people talk about reconciliation, and for me personally, it is this aspect of… it's an ongoing process and we never quite know where we're going to need to know, like, where we're going to need to go in the future, until we start taking some steps. So, we might find out we maybe went down a path that we have to loop back around, or we come to another fork in the road and we're not sure where to go. But having it be an ongoing process that requires continual critical engagement and critical engagement with who's involved in the conversation, too, in particular. You know, there was a point where conversations around academia like this, there would not be people like me because I would have had my Indian status stripped from me to try and be involved in academia. So change is inevitable. We have always experienced change. That might sound like a threat: “change is inevitable. Fear it.” No. Accept that change will happen. And we have the option to either float down this river or we can take an active role in paddling where we can actually be bothered to look out for rocks, to see if there's people who might be in the river, who we need to pick up along the way. So I'd like to see it mentioned how it's like a critical ongoing process that requires self-reflection on even a position statement. Maybe in 10 years a new statement will have to be written. Who knows.

Facilitator 2: Fantastic. Thank you. Anyone else want to offer some thoughts? Yeah, Brian.

Hotson: I think we have to make sure in such a statement that we come very clear about the colonial nature of education in Canada and Western education in general. We also have to be aware of what's happening in the South below us, in the United States, where our colleagues are constantly under threat for fire for saying things that are not as controversial as what we're saying here now. And I think that's very important. It's also very important, I think, that this statement has students who are, you know, from across Canada, have the ability to add to such a statement and be involved. I often find that

especially in administration and faculty, they're very good at putting out statements, but they forget the third pillar of education, which is students.

Facilitator 2: Absolutely. Thank you, Brian. Katja?

Thieme: I am thinking about the importance of discussing or mentioning the materiality or the material effects of citation. It is a disembodied practice, but it has effects for people's livelihoods and people's continued ability to participate in knowledge making processes or governing processes. And so, like that's always at the forefront of my mind. Along with that, the need to think in all directions of marginalization. Maybe not always possible all at the same time, but perhaps framing it in a way that Lorisia did,, as an ongoing process. So, we can pay attention to the place of Indigenous knowledge makers in our work, we can pay attention to the place of precarious academics in our work, we can pay attention to the place of non-normatively gendered voices that we cite, we can pay attention to the place of a people of different socio-economic status. So there are many dimensions to it in my mind. I would want that to be a part of the statement.

Facilitator 2: Okay. Yes, thank you. So many good points that we will hopefully grapple with in the drafting or discussing portion of the workshop. I would just like to thank everybody who took part in this panel. What a wise and generous set of responses. I feel really lucky to have been able to take part in this, and I really appreciate you all weighing in such thoughtful, considered and... *smart* for lack of a better word? I'm like, these are very *smart* responses. So, thank you.

Interview with Dr. Hannah McGregor, Director and Associate Professor of Publishing (SFU), Part One[7]

Facilitated by Natalie Boldt (UVic)

August 23rd, 2024

Interview Questions

- What does it mean to practice citational justice?
- In your opinion, is there a difference in the roles of individual academics/students, institutional policies, and institutional staff in citational justice?
- What do you see as the major challenges in teaching citational justice to undergraduate or graduate students?

---

[7] See Appendix D for Part Two.

- If you had the opportunity to give advice to any writing instructor or writing centre staff (or any other writing practitioner), what might you say?
- What do you think makes Citational Justice in what is now called Canada unique? What are the issues that students and scholars in what is now called Canada deal with?
- We are going to draft a position statement on Citational Justice in what is now called Canada. What do you think is crucial information to include in such a position statement?

Transcript

Interviewer (Natalie Boldt): So, we'll just jump into the deep end of the pool: what does it mean to practice citational justice?

Dr. Hannah McGregor: Oh, okay. So I think of citational justice as incorporating, but moving significantly beyond, sort of, "appropriate academic behaviour" around citing your sources, right? So we've got this baseline of like, it's really important we teach our students not to plagiarize, that we teach our students to think about where they're getting their information, and about how to clearly mark where they're getting their information. You know, and also how to make sure that where they're getting their information is good, which is a really, really vital piece of the whole conversation.

And citational justice incorporates that, but also considers what are the ethics and politics of the actual texts that we are teaching our students as theoretical touchpoints within our disciplines. You know, what do we assume to be the baseline canon that students need to learn, know how to cite, you know, be aware of in order to have a firm grounding in our particular discipline? Who do we like default to as the source of particular theoretical ideas? You know, do we always default to Foucault when we're talking about the Panopticon, or do we think about the like really important contributions that Black scholars have made to rooting the Panopticon, in fact, in slave ships and the technologies of the surveillance of Black bodies? So part of it, citational justice, for me is actually class design, like course design: who are we teaching and why? Who are we teaching our students are the foundational thinkers in our various fields?

It is also about what we teach them constitutes legitimate knowledge and illegitimate knowledge. So, are we making our students only use, you know, double anonymous peer-reviewed journal articles? If so, have we thought about whose knowledge gets privileged in those formats and whose knowledge gets left out? Can we teach them to think about oral knowledges, about community-based knowledges, about, you know, the sort of, different forms of knowledge and expertise that fall outside of conventional scholarly publishing

venues? And that, for me, all falls within the conversation of citational justice, right? Not only “are we setting things correctly,” but who are we sitting in the first place and why?

Interviewer: Mhmm. Absolutely. And what do you see as the major challenges in teaching citational justice to undergraduate or graduate students?

McGregor: For me, the biggest challenge is finding the balance between teaching them how to navigate misinformation on the Internet while also teaching them not to assume that because something was written by an authority or an academic that means it's true or legitimate. And that is a significantly more nuanced form of critical thinking and critical navigation of knowledge than I think we often do in our classrooms because it's really hard. Like, it's hard to do ourselves, right? It’s just... it's just a hard skill. And so I think, for example about talking to my students about what constitutes a legitimate source when they're fact-checking something. I do a lot these days... I teach a lot more fact-checking than I teach research because I find that unless we are going very, very deep on something, it's very easy for them to find information. Right? It's not hard for them to find the answer to a thing or find out who a person is or find a bunch of books on a topic. What is *hard* is for them to navigate the sheer overwhelm of the amount of information that they are going to find and figure out which information they are going to privilege, which information they're going to focus on, and I want that to be a thing that they can think about not only in their own... like in their classroom and in the context of their coursework, but also in their own lives. Right? I want that to be sort of a skill that they bring out. To be like, how do I tell if a TikTok is bullshit?

Interviewer: Yes.

McGregor: Right? Like what are the critical thinking skills that I bring into the places where I am actually receiving information? The way that I often teach it these days, uh, is [through] a phrase that I borrowed from the podcast *Who? Weekly,* which is a celebrity gossip podcast – and they are very attentive to the question of verifying rumours, right? Because celebrity gossip moves through really interesting, unusual chains of information. And they refer to, like, doing your due diligence as a writer and podcaster, as doing a “second Google.” And I love that. And it's the phrase that I now use when I'm teaching students how to fact check. I'm like, don't just put it in and take the first thing that comes up. You’ve got to do a second Google. You’ve got to check a different source, check something else that is going to reinforce. So like, if you have found something where you’re like, this is really great and this is really interesting knowledge, and it comes from a source that is not something that would be considered necessarily legitimate in a classroom setting, so it comes from a TikTok or a blog or what have you, it's like cool. I'm not saying you can't use that. I'm saying you need to do a second Google.

Interviewer: Yes. Duck duck go again.

McGregor: I need you to find some other stuff. I need you to fact check this thing, right? So what can you find that is, you know, has been legitimized, right? That somebody has checked, that somebody with the expertise to know has checked. And that might be a newspaper article, it might be a journal article, it might be a Wikipedia article with a bunch of good links. It can be a lot of different things, but you gotta do your second Google.

Interviewer: Right. Right. Yeah. And I love the framing, too: we can apply this critical skill to TikTok. It is the most transferable skill. Fact checking.

McGregor: It's the most transferable skill. It's the one that I most want people to leave my classrooms with, is the ability to encounter information in the world and be like, "huh, I wonder if that's true?" Yeah, not to be like, "well, it must be true. I saw it on my phone."

Interviewer: Yeah.

McGregor: Like. No, no, no, no, no. I'm mean, this is… I'm also trying to treat teach my boomer parents this, right?

Interviewer: Absolutely. And it goes both directions too, right? Like you believe nothing and you go full, you know, suspicious or you believe everything. And it's like, no, we need to sort of find our space in the middle here.

McGregor: There's gotta be a middle ground. My dad once repeated a theory I had voiced to him. I was like, theorizing why millennials and Gen Z were better at having conversations about vaccine status and testing than boomers were. And I was like, I think it's because we came of age in an era where you had to have conversations about STIs as you were navigating intimate relationships, and so we're used to having conversations about consent, about safety, about have you been tested? Are you like… is this going to be… you know, and that's like, awkward. But like, boomers don't have that experience, right? They came of age before the AIDS crisis and… I was like this, you know, here's my theory. And then the next time I was talking to him on the phone, he was like, yeah, I read an article in the newspaper about how my generation isn't as good as and… I was like. No, you didn't. You didn't read an article in the newspaper. That was some shit I said!

Interviewer: [*Laughs.*] Okay. In all fairness, I think I've probably done that before – slightly less egregiously, but I think I've said something like, "well, I heard on the news…" and then my partner will be like, did you hear it on the news or did you see it on Instagram? And I'm like, that may have been the case.

McGregor: [*Laughs.*] Really hard to say. Yeah, really. Hard to say. And that is why you have to do a second Google.

Interviewer: Yes.

McGregor: Can't remember if you heard it on the news or saw it on Instagram? Google it.

Interviewer: It, yeah. Yes. And sometimes news does show up on Instagram, so you know...

McGregor: 100% they are not mutually exclusive.

Interviewer: Yes, yeah. Although in Canada, I guess maybe they are becoming more mutually exclusive... [*McGregor laughs.*]

Okay. So, we are going to draft a position statement that's part of the goal of the workshops on citational justice and what is not now called Canada. What do you think is crucial information to include in such a position statement?

McGregor: I think that it is really crucial to think about the many, many places that knowledge comes from. And to ensure that we are developing the skills to engage with knowledge that comes from multiple sources, which includes things as simple as making sure that we know how to put things in a work cited, you know? Making things citable that have not been conventionally citable. You know, and some of that's technological infrastructure: how do we make sure that like this, this relatively ephemeral form of online information can be... It's like a major purpose of citation is that the person reading the work can go and find that thing. So if that thing's going to disappear, how do we deal with that? But also recognizing that there are many forms of knowledge that exist outside of the parameters of scholarly communication, and that the citability of those extends beyond the simple, like having the right MLA format and into things like the ethics of who particular knowledge belongs to, what can and should be shared, how it can and should be shared, how it can and should be acknowledged. You know, what is the difference between being inspired by something and stealing from something? And how do you know? Is it enough to cite your sources if you are misappropriating knowledge or cultural practices that come from a culture that is not your own? Or does citational justice in that case, extend to the question of whether that is yours to use at all in the first place. I think we need significantly more nuance about both the sources of knowledge and the ethical ways to engage with those knowledges.

Interviewer: Mhmm. And I think going back to what you were saying earlier, sometimes the... this might have been more to with the accessibility and technology bit, but like the legality of it or the laws that we have in place and like copyright laws and all of that, those

are bare minimums, but they actually don't always speak to the ethics of citation in a very robust way.

McGregor: Yeah, there's an article I come back to time and time again, but it's almost 10 years old now. It's called "#Transform, DH." It's by Moya Bailey. And it is about a DH project that she was doing about the use of hashtags in Black trans women's online communities and how she wanted to be engaging with these communities and the way they were using hashtags and recognized the deep insufficiency of the ethics approval process within her institution. That like, yeah, do that for sure. But also, that model is so insufficient when you are talking about working with a sort of deeply and multiply marginalized community. And so, what she did was create an Advisory Board of Black Trans Femmes to guide her in her work, but also to make sure that she could do things that were useful for them as well. Right? To be like, I'm not just taking from your community. I'm not just taking knowledge from your community and turning it into scholarship. I'm also like, what do you need from me? What would be useful from me? Like what tools or resources or forms of connection, or whatever I have access to as a university scholar would/could I, sort of, recompense you with?

And it's that kind of like, sure: begin with the baseline legalities of the institution, but also ask yourself, what more can or should I be doing beyond these structures?

Interviewer: Yeah. Almost like, the people who you might otherwise be researching on, you start researching with them. They become like co-collaborators or...

McGregor: Precisely. There's a version of that that I really like that a number of my colleagues have done. Minelle Mahtani at UBC has incorporated this into her course, and it is that students choose one of the people whose work they engaged with during the semester and write to them to say how engaging with their work impacted them. And it's, you know, this different model of like, I'm going to let you know that I'm engaging with your work and tell you how, and it's a kind of reciprocity that we often don't think about when we think about citation. But, you know, it's a really interesting opportunity to think about citation as dialogue.

Interviewer: Yeah, yeah, absolutely. Okay, if you had an opportunity to give advice to any writing instructor or writing centre staff – which is me! So if you had an opportunity to give me advice about citational justice – what might you say?

McGregor: Hmm. [*Long pause.*] I don't know... I don't know if I have much more than what I've already said.

Interviewer: Yeah, that's true. Okay, so everything you just said, just sort of copied back. All of the stuff. Okay. So, a final question, if you have time, Hannah, is what do you think makes citational justice in what is now called Canada unique? What are the issues that students and scholars in what is now called Canada deal with?

McGregor: Yeah. I mean, I think one of the really vital ones is the recognition of the complexity and the value of Indigenous knowledges. You know I'm... I was at a UBC public humanities celebration of drag last night that was like a combination of drag performances and then scholars talking about drag. It was very cool. Uh, at one point an old white man stood up and talked for a while.

Interviewer: As they do.

McGregor: As they do. And he started talking about, you know, why he thinks it's really important to archive things. And he was like, “you know, I've got Native blood on both sides." We'll just take that with a huge heaping of salt... And he's like, “Native people have storytelling traditions, but because they never wrote anything down, all of those have now been lost.” And I was like, well, that's wrong. That's extremely wrong on multiple levels. That's... I wanted to put my hand up and be like, no, no. Okay. We're not doing this. But, all of the citation practices that universities use, all of the citation guides, are based on exactly that presumption that real knowledge is written down and published somewhere.

And, on the flip... well, not on the flip side. You know, an additional complication of this is that publication means *publicness*, which, once something is published, it is out in the world. Anybody can read it. Anybody can cite it. Other forms of knowledge, including community-based knowledges and oral knowledges, are not necessarily for everyone or for every time. And so, you know, we see this in conversations about, for example, Open Access and digitization, that from very early on, Indigenous scholars have been saying like we can't assume that everything should be open for everyone all the time. We can't digitize materials that have protocols around who is supposed to have access to those materials and just make them for everyone. And so, I think when we are thinking about what citational justice means in Canada, we need to be thinking about the degree to which our country is built on the systematic oppression and misappropriation of Indigenous knowledges and how neither fully appropriating those into our institutions, nor continuing to exclude them from our institutions is sufficient.

Interviewer: Well, that brings us to the end of a huge slew of questions. Thank you.

McGregor: My pleasure.

Interviewer: Yeah. Okay. Well, thank you so much, Hannah, for taking the time to do this. Contribute to the project and it's... it's been such a pleasure to meet you.

McGregor: Yeah. Lovely to meet you as well.

Interview with Dr. Louis Maraj, Assistant Professor, School of Journalism, Writing, and Media (UBC)

Facilitated by Kara Hagedorn (UVic)

Interview Questions

- What does it mean to practice citational justice?
- In your opinion, is there a difference in the roles of individual academics/students, institutional policies, and institutional staff in citational justice?
- What do you see as the major challenges in teaching citational justice to undergraduate or graduate students?
- If you had the opportunity to give advice to any writing instructor or writing centre staff (or any other writing practitioner), what might you say?
- What do you think makes Citational Justice in what is now called Canada unique? What are the issues that students and scholars in what is now called Canada deal with?
- We are going to draft a position statement on Citational Justice in what is now called Canada. What do you think is crucial information to include in such a position statement?

Transcript

Interviewer (Kara Hagedorn): Okay, so let's see, if you don't mind, I would actually like to start with a territory acknowledgement. Because each of these interviews have kind of started as such, and what I'm actually doing for a territory acknowledgement is actually a bit unorthodox to what I've kind of seen being done with these in the past. And it is actually a territory knowledge that I heard at the beginning of Dr. Peyman Vahabzadeh in his graduate social theory seminar last year. And I think it kind of gets to the heart of what I wish to hear when we recite these territory acknowledgments. Especially having to do with Vancouver Island and its history with Indigenous people.

So it goes: Between 1850 and 1854 James Douglas the chief factor of Fort Victoria and the governor of the colony, entered into a series of treaties with some of the indigenous peoples of southern Vancouver Island and the vicinity of Port Hardy. What is important to note about these treaties is that they were negotiated and agreed to through oral discussions. And at the time when the official written documents were ready-made, though, James Douglas had the leaders sign blank papers that were to become the written

documents, and then had the text of these treaties written in afterwards without consent or collaboration with the indigenous people of land. The image of the blank piece of paper is symbolic of how colonialism functions. And what I mean by this is that it functions as a means to keep us in the dark.

When I decided to adopt Dr. Peyman Vahabzadeh's territory acknowledgement, I decided to do more research regarding the Douglas treaties and its history. And I think it's important to note that not a single government website mentions how the Douglas treaties were presented to the Indigenous leaders as blank pieces of paper. And the only place I found it mentioned was on the website for the Te'mexw Treaty Association, which is a nonprofit society formed of the five Coast Salish nations. And if there is one thing that this observation reveals, it's that the relationship between the blank piece of paper and colonialism is not in the past, but its legacy of course lives on to this day.

Okay. So to begin our questions, our questions for citation justice... let's go. So, I suppose we're just going to start off with the big one of: what does it mean to practice citational justice to you Dr. Maraj?

Dr. Louis Maraj: Thank you, and thank you for the, or for that bit of history and that's important. I think citational justice means something a little bit difference for me, then is... than what is usually conjured as citational justice in statements, institutional statements that I've seen, in an editorial, or heuristics, or anti-racist guides, to editing etc. that I've seen really heavily circulated. I would say between 2020 and now a lot of it has happened I think in the wake of the protests in 2020. The kind of citational justice, though, it had been happening before. And so, I'll start by explaining that frame, and then why I think it's necessary to shift from that frame. If we are to start thinking a little bit more critically about what we mean by justice.

So, citation justice in a lot of these statements and heuristics often call upon the notion of inclusion. And inclusion in the sense of ensuring that historically marginalized, and culturally marginalized authors, authors of those backgrounds are represented on citation lists. And a lot of them carry with, a lot of these statements carry with them, ways to kind of check for, check a particular piece though writing or cited reference this for whether or not this is the case or, to ask questions, like you know it's the "are the dominant threads of writing studies, oratorical studies – whatever subfield or field, that we're thinking about – overrepresented in a particular way?" And "how can we combat that by including more authors, more different kinds in some cases, different kinds of information in in reference lesson, the current kind of sort of mechanism for, that, citation happens within." This [kind of thinking/reasoning] is problematic to me – from my view – because when we start thinking about citation as a particular kind of currency, then we are operating by the same colonial capitalist and racist logics that have brought us to the place that we are today. When it comes to the exclusion of those historically marginalized peoples.

Citation as a currency is only going to sort of create or report or present a particular group of people within the subgroups of the historically marginalized "category." And so, one of the one, of the projects that I worked on that I presented at CCCC's was about this recent, I looked particularly at data from the last, I wanna say 8 years – I think I took 2014 and start 2014 to 2022 – looked at data around the citation of scholars of colour. Who had either a one major award at the CCCC's conference, the four Cs, or had chaired the conference. So, scholars of colour who had either, or want to, know they would have one word, or they had chaired the conference, and I looked at the citation frequency of these scholars, and created, like, graphs – which is not something I usually do – to illustrate how this actually plays out. When we think about who, when we ask people to include historically marginalized particularly marginalized author, that what actually happens, how it plays out, is that you've got 3 scholars in the, in the study, I did three scholars, and I can, I can share screen and show them, the graph, 3 scholars who have been cited way more times. And then, a lot of people here who have been cited less than 50 times. And so, this, this, this was the, the sort of crux of the idea I was trying to demonstrate; is that we, what plays out, what pans out...

So, in theory we the... The idea behind citation justice in a dominant sort of usage right now is, is yes, we want to have different kinds of information and different people be seen as legitimate sources of knowledge. Absolutely 100%. Fine. Most of the time this is framed within an intersectional framework. And, and, and I can say more about why that become an issue as well, because the framework of intersectionality has been co-opted for sort of neoliberal politics. Right? So, that also is contributing to what's happening. And so, you, you, you get a motive or intent that actually is, is important. And which while, we want to change the landscape of what intellectual, what is counted, and "intellectual knowledge," and we want to see different kinds of information produced as legitimate through the same kind of, like, mechanisms that have been doing what they've been doing for a long time. When it plays out, what happens is a particular figure becomes, that becomes the, the token representations of what it means to justly cite. And so, then, we get an over representation of a small amount of work on the same logic, is reproduced, that was produced before. And so, it's not necessary, and so when we play a particular kind of representational politics game, with citation justice, then, what results from that is a reproduction of the logics that led to this particular problem in the first place.

And so, to make this argument not to belabor it too much, but to make this argument I was drawing from black studies will from Caribbean theorists, Sylvia Winters' work on the way that we have ideas about who can be human and who's left outside of that category. And if we work by the same mechanisms that we continually work to say, "these are this is ways that you got to be human," then we're always going to leave out the most dispossessed people, [they] are going to always be the antithesis of who we believe to be human. And we just kind of regurgitate the same sort of logic from the same issue. So, what does that leave

us with? Or I guess, I, I want to actually say something about intersectionality, and all that [it's] been wrapped up in this.

So, in a lot of ways intersectionality represented at its core a kind of frame-breaking mechanism, to understand how modularization takes the takes place. And in a lot of ways, it's been kind of used in the in the opposite way from which it was it was kind of bought through at least in an academic sense. So one of the ways that introduction of the end its politics or intersectional theory and its politics has been has been used as this kind of like opposites to how it was initially practiced, or formulated as theoretical idea, is that often—quite often—[for example,] you see the citation of Kimberly Crenshaw, who is important to the formulation of intersectional theory in the academy [but] without the kind of context for "hey black woman had been practicing intersectional politics for a very long time and black women black, queer women, the Combahee River Collective, you can go back, and back, and back in history to the, to Sojourner Truth. You can go back through there, I know Julia Cooper, a lot of 19th-century figure, is if you visit their text, you will understand that what they're doing is bringing an intersection intersectional framework to what they're doing. So, this is not a critique of Kimberly Crenshaw, this is a critique of how Crenshaw has been taken out. And it's that over-representation. So, you've got intersection, intersectionality equals Kimberly Crenshaw. And so, then that's the logic of the, logic of the colonial Academy. Right? Tying one idea to 1 person. And so, and commodifying it [too]. Then, what we we've had in the popularization of this is that we, we've got, we've gotten to the point where intersectionality less than, it's represented less as a critical framework for critiquing power structures on the impossibility of being recognized, or seen as, as being marginalized by those structures, and more as an individual-weighted kind-of-like neoliberal commodity. A list of particular positions, and a way to engage in, but a lot of folks think about as 9 RT Olympics. So how do we find the most the most oppressed person in the room, and give them space to speak?

When intersectional theory, of course is about critiquing power, it's about the Patricia Collins would call the "matrices of domination," it's less about individual actors and more about how those power structures impact individual actors and individual groups within that, within that system, and, the impossibility of saying: "hey we can change this particular institution that is operating on these sort, of sort, of binary codes to understand, to be legible, and then will have some kind of sort of difference outcome." And so, but it's been it's been picked up and used that way. So, when you see citational justice statements draw on this theory, they're generally kind of using this language from the "multi-marginalized," they draw on the logics of almost, as to imply the more oppressed somebody is, the more they will be cited, and they spend less time thinking about forms of knowledge, and what, what, what kinds of, what we see as a legitimate "text." And what we see, as how do we recognize that there are different ways that people make knowledge outside of the frameworks of the academic space? And even in, even in thinking outside of the academic space, the, the logics are, are a lot to have to contend with still. Right? So, if

you try to bring in or think through "hey, how do I cite something that quite frankly probably wasn't made for the logics of citations? probably wasn't made to be accounted for in western academic texts?" That it often runs up the kind of gatekeeping of okayAY, but why is this necessary? Okay but couldn't you find something else? Okay, but, but you know how does this fit into the dominant language of the composition that's happening over here? How do we translate something that's not meant to be translatable? How do we...? You know, and then all of those questions, it kind of serves to discourage people who wants to do that kind of work, who want to bring in those knowledges. So, that's the kind of conundrum that we're kind of left in.

And so, that's I think the, the issue actually for me with a lot of citation justice frameworks now. I have that experience, as an author myself, having to go through peer-review, and then to have a group of editors say "Okay we're going to do our entire assistance check now, and then go through something that had done through peer-review and say "hey I think you're not citing this person I think they said this in this particular place" only to have to write back and say "that person isn't talking about that" so because what, what the metrics of the "anti-racist" editorial guideline is, "well why don't we cite a particular person from these identity categories here?" Instead of, "how do we ensure that a conversation is taking place with the folks who are bringing knowledge that is the kind of knowledge that challenges what we understand particular ideas?" That's a really probably a really long-winded way of not answering the question.

What is citation justice for me? I think citational justice, for me, is an interrogation of the category of what we might by justice.

Interviewer: Yes, yes.

Maraj: And reference.

Interviewer: Yes and also what you mentioned with the fact that we're coming up to this point where, like, you said, the protests in 2020, just have entirely changed how, like, we have come up to that moment; into how we understand the ways in which, like, activism, and like the ways in which institutional... theory and practices of all kind fit together. As opposed to just really being these thinking that these are completely separate realms; it's like, no, like we, we, can only get so far when it comes to, like, policy making, until we need to actually challenge the ways in which policies create these ways of thinking in the individual... That doesn't, that it almost takes them like, apart from their own ability to even just be a human being in, like, understanding, just like the ways in which how they think about their own knowledge and how, like, you know how they want to... I guess make sure that certain policies are worked because of whatever reasons. It's just yeah I understand what you mean by kind of taking that question and really breaking down, like, well what do we even mean by justice anymore? At this point in time, especially when it comes to how

policies are—in the way that people enact those policies—and how the institution itself is a, like you said, it's the way that neoliberalism has kind of taken over even the ways in which we talk about ourselves as being in, in scholarship.

So, yes... it's... thank you for answering that in that manner that was great. Right. Okay, so let's see. Geez, by all means, if you want, take whatever you want from these questions, and answer them like how you want to answer. Like, the root of what you're getting at with these questions, please do that, like, then throughout the answer please. Especially with what you think and how we're framing these questions to think of, don't think about how... what we want to get out of you... what you know from the question. I... it's important for us to hear how you even understand the question because that's, that's, that's, that's where the richness of... the richness of this workshop lies.

Okay in your opinion is there a difference in the roles of individual academics and students institutional policies and interested institutional staff in citation justice? Your kind of already, like answered this a bit, but like, I guess it kind of... it does tie into the ways in which I guess students... yeah, so is there anything... the roles of individual students, institutional policies, and institutional staff, in the citational, in citational justice?

An interviewee actually said... this is what she kind of said in asking for this question to be posed. She said, "I think this comes from my own experience discussing who the labour of decolonization falls on. Typically, it is discussed in terms of where it should fall. I'm wondering if it should be thought of as how different roles need to be created as fulsome positions and then need to create statements that recognizes the positionality of these different roles; if there is, if they seems to be differences. It also might give the staff and professors a chance to discuss how institutional policy can impact their capacity to make change if that is a factor.

So yeah.

Maraj: So, I I'm coming to this question from the angle of... I, I don't know how frank I should be, I guess... Fuck the institution. And so I mean the idea for... the idea of the colonial work, anti-racist colonial work, or whatever you wanna call it, justice oriented work, is less about what we can do to change an institution, and more about what we can do to change our relationships to each other to the places that we exist in, and the people that we exist around. And so, the I guess I would say that policy making is necessarily my bag. I don't... when I have to think about policy, I do think about them in critical ways, but I also think about them in the context of who is this policy ultimately deemed to serve. And so, particular policy in an historically white university, on stolen land is only going to serve the people who stole the money and who the university is walking in as someone who "belongs.

How can a policy help create different kinds of relationships of policy making—create different relationships—between the people making it and the place that they're making it? Absolutely. And so, I think I care less about the product that comes out of things and what kinds of policies or statements etc. that happened, and more about the process of what it means to be in whatever space, whatever community, in whatever environment, in, in, in... And think about our relations to all of the... all of those actors in a different way, than where sort, of asked to think about them from sort of like hegemonic dominant colonial frameworks.

So, what that means is that policy is not going to capture particular kinds of come existences, expressive sort of forms of thoughts, particular kinds of... sort of place-based knowledges that do exists. And so, it's a... it... for me, I like... I don't want to say, "I'm not going to answer the question!"

But what I... what I would say is... but the what's more important I think, in trying to create change through things like, policy is things like right space discourse, things like statements or any kind of static document, or framework... is the people and the place in which it happened. I guess that's my short answer. I can go further in and in-depth with this but it's really about asking the question of what is our relationship to each other, and to the environment.

Interviewer: Yeah, I really like how you're kind of getting to the heart of this. Because I also have this in my mind. When it comes to understanding how policies in university... is does surprise me so much to realize how much I witness... people, instructors, professors, anyone who works in the university, how much they really like..., they almost are so aware of how policies are like, in this place. And they try to always kind of bounce off of them to ensure that they are performing in, in conjunction with like, the ways in which the institution wants to be this place. And I think how you're... you mentioned that you're just, like, you are less focused on, like, the outcomes and the sense of like putting a policy in place. And I think you're right. Like, in the sense that, really start agree with you in that my question is, like, haven't we seen enough where policies that are kind of put in place and then it actually produces certain kind of outcomes that require more specific kinds of policies to be in place. Which again, can it takes it there's a taking away of so there's something that kind of I find is taken away when certain ways in which people have tried to enact policies that just, I don't even know how to describe it.

But I do I do understand what you're what you're describing for me...

Maraj: I... the way that I would put this... I would try to articulate if I... if I can riff off of what you're saying is, that the logics are extracted. And so, if the goal is to extract from a group of people a particular kind of resource, then the relationship that people are going to have with each other is one of, you know, one that is resource driven. And so, even that sort of

tone, and the tenor, and the logic of the conversations then have to be about, "how do we still manage to extract?" And then, our kind of relation to each other becomes, well, you know, I don't necessarily have... I don't have any other framework to think through this, but the framework of well, "this is what this is a resource I'm supposed to, like to manufacture from our meeting." And so, that's I think, it's, it without saying, without consciously saying, "how do we undo those logics?" Or "how do we challenge those logics?" Then, what we're doing is producing the same logic.

I think that that's kind of, like at the heart of anti-colonial, or decolonial thinking. But we have to ask the question not from the standpoint of what we are doing to produce? Or to build? And more from the standpoint of what are we doing to engage? And like, you know exists with each other in ways that aren't you know that are not based on these next extracted logics."

Interviewer: Yes, yes, yeah. Like you've mentioned, you've repeatedly used language that has everything to do with, like capitalism, neoliberalism, and you're absolutely right. It's like, there's this end, you're absolutely right, it's like there's this... once that kind of language gets into our... how we're framing everything, then, if then... it's just like, yes, it's definitely: what other language is there that enables us to talk about this? So that, like you said, it engages and creates and produces, manufacturers, and like reduces something, like everything to a currency. So, thank you.

Yeah. Okay, let's see... can... what do you see as the major challenges in teaching citational justice to undergraduate or graduate students as your position as professor instructor?

Maraj: I think the... again I mean a lot of it has to.... the challenges have to do with what the institution expects happen in spaces. And the surveillant mechanism that the institution uses ensure that those things happen in those spaces. So, the kinds of... you know institutional structures that say, "hey, you know you must produce X kind of paper at the end of this particular course, and we need to ensure that X amount of "writing" happens in this space, regardless of who is coming to that space, and how." That's probably the biggest challenge and the surveillance around that. Because there is a surveillance in the form of the teaching reviews, and evaluations, and whatnot, but there's also the surveillance that happens interpersonally between people.

When we're approaching others and what we're approaching them with is the kind of extractive institutional logic. And so, in the classroom thinking through, for me, knowledge making is about conversation. And when we think about what citation is, it's about calling-in a way towards conversation. Calling or naming who we're speaking to. And so, to unpack those logics in a classroom, it means to ask students, to think about at of course who they are, and where they're coming from, and who they're coming with, and what places and

people they're bringing with them. But also, how are they speaking to those people, and places, to other people and their places, and what they're bringing with them, in a way that's different from what was there before.

It's very abstract when I'm explaining right now. But it's really about getting to this place where we're not thinking along the lines of, "well, I need X amount of sources to be in this paper, and I need things that only agree with me." Because, I find, in a lot of the discourse around, like, in in a lot of ways when I've taught writing—especially feature writing—the idea that I'm confronted with, when it comes to citation, is "how do I make sure that I find enough people who agree with me?" Or there's a lot of ways that citation, from in that space is understood as, "well, I need to illustrate how what I'm saying is legitimate—and legitimate through the particular forms—and logics that I've been taught that's been legitimate."

So, I kind of asked the question, like, "how do you... what's legitimate to you? What's been your experience?" And a lot of the work that I do in the first two weeks of class, I ask students to write about their experiences with particular kinds of... "coming up against," "who they are," "social identity categories," that have been thrust on them. Or they pick up on, "what does that mean?" and "who is that calling upon right?" Like, "who are you calling into a conversation? Especially when you just say, "this is who I am," and to work from that framing. To then think about the knowledge that they're bringing to write about, or think about, or to talk about, engage with, whatever it is that they hope to engage with. And so, a large part of it has to do with this interrogation of identity, and how is that constructed, and what are you bringing with you and why the frames that you are bringing with you need to be legitimated, and why you think they need to be legitimated, in what ways and how can you think about that from a different point, from a different kind of space.

Like, knowledge is that we're all very complex and all but bringing different parts of us to different places. How do we how do we imagine talking to each other? When really you know "citation" is really about having a conversation. As opposed to, "how do I illustrate it as a kind of legitimacy?" As the legit... legitimacy logic is how we get down the road of extraction. As opposed to exchange and conversation.

And so, I don't know if that answers your questions. So, it's really about kind of unpacking yes what we're bringing to the space with bringing, why we're bringing it, and how that, in of itself, and this may be what the interviewee was asking about positionality is... that opposing that idea. How we are mobilizing that when we try to talk to other people differently, how do we talk to people differently? In ways that in general, are very fine. Like structures of trauma and harm?

Interviewer: Yeah. I mean the question was just about like how do you teach citational justice in the classroom? And like, you very much described how, for you, it's important for

the students to think critically of, like, what they're bringing to the classroom, and how they are citing, is like you said, it's a conversation. And of course, there is the ways in which we all think about citation. How it just kind of brings us into the future, or kind of legitimizing, like future for us because we're using sources that come from legitimate sites, that you know the university has deemed as such.

So, it's... you definitely kind of stress the point that, for you, it is about thinking critically of all the steps that have led you up to this point of, like, being responsible for citing, and creating, and joining conversations. So that's... yeah... that speaks to a very wise teaching style. So, thank you for that.

Okay let's see oh if you have the opportunity to give advice to any writing instructors or centre staff, what would you say regarding citational justice? I mean you did kind of give me a lot of this, but yeah there's anything else that comes to mind.

Maraj: Yeah, yeah I mean I would push, I would, I don't like giving " advice" because I feel like there's never a one-size-fits-all response for, like, really anything. I wouldn't want to say it like, "X is this and therefore that's the way that we should see it." Because for me, it's like, this is what citation, justice, or citation or justices is for dominator conversation, and then my hope is that we kind of interrogate those things, so that we can come to a place where we're engaging less with its structural power and mechanisms of structural power and more with each other. And so, the "advice" would be starting from a position that is critical of what we are, what we received as knowledge, and why we are to sort of "wholesale believe" what we believe, to be, you know knowledge as "legitimate."

And to think through what it might mean to not think of, you know, printed text, or concrete so that frameworks, or knowledge is or structures, as closed in the end, and instead alive, and you know, and able to be you know moved, and changed, and trying to think around how we think around, even talking through what that change might look like. Yeah.

Interviewer: Thank you. Okay. And you know what since we only have about 15 minutes, I'll just go right to the last question because... it's kind of what we need to ask or whatever yeah what we need to ask as we draft a position statement on citational justice.

What do you think is crucial information to include in such a position statement? Answer that however you want to answer it...

Maraj: Might I suggest not writing a statement? Maybe, what maybe I don't know, what may... depends on... I can't tell other people what to do with, either their... I don't know what your environment looks like... I don't know what your institutional politics look like. But I think there is a way that the genre of the statement has caused this kind of very extractive relationship we have with activism, and notions of "justice."

And so, there is a way that I think folks have been critically engaging this, statement genre, to the I forget what the actual name of it, but I is I think it's like the same statement commands about around black language after the 2020 protest that was put out by a group of black scholars and writing studies. That was sort of supposed to be this anti-statement. And so, like that's an example of how the genre of statement might be sort of critiqued. As you make… as you as you to do the kind of work that a statement… should so… rather than setting one’s foot down in place… and saying, "this is, this is where we are!" Which is, to me, is a colonial logic, saying, you know, "how do we present space for conversations that happen and what does the form, in what form, would like, in one format can take place?" Which is not to say that one couldn't say here are the things that are important to the group of people and here's why this is not to say, I'm not saying don't… I'm not throwing the baby out with the bathwater. And I'm not saying that that not every statement is, I'm not saying that at all. But I'm saying, in this moment where we come to expect activists work to to look a particular way. I feel very much like what we need to be doing is asking, "how can it look like something else?" And the form that we're doing it in then, is going to it's going to have huge implications on the content, and how the content is received.

Interviewer: Excellent.

Maraj: I'm sorry.

Interviewer: Why are you sorry? Don't be sorry! No, no. Do not apologize. That was fantastic. Thank you! That was… that was very… that's… that's wonderful. I was reading some of your work before the interview, I was just like, I think this is going to be fantastic.

And yeah, I again, I really, appreciate you taking the time to just even engage with us in this workshop because I know I know all instructors and professors are very busy right now, and I know you're doing great work. And yeah. So, this is… this is exactly the kinds of answers that I was excited to… hope to get. Because it's… it's not just about… of course, you know, like shouldn't say playing along… sorry… engaging in these workshops in a way that kind of give us the kind of, you know, ideas for policy making that we want to have but it's also about being critical of the ways in which all of these things are kind of coming together. To hope to do the kind of work that it wants to do. And I think you provided a lot of insight and ideas and your rich perspective. So, thank you very much for sharing this with me today.

Maraj: Thank you for having me. I'm hoping that this was useful. Not, you know, not yeah, I'm hoping this is… this was useful. But I have a lot of insecurities about, you know, from past experiences about you know feeling like I'm being anti-just to be anti-just. But it really isn't I'm not just trying to be a stick in the mud when I when I take the positions that I take. I

really, I'm, yeah… I'm trying to work with others to see a different world, than what we currently exist in. Yes.

Interviewer: I mean being an activist means you have a fire in you, and sometimes that fire is able to maintain, sometimes it gets ahead of you, and you know when the oxygen for the fire comes in, yes, it's good to kind of produce this kind of energy. And so, you know I understand the insecurity, of like the anti for the sake of being anti, but we need people… we need these voices we need activists. Activist energy… to be in the institution because like, that, it comes from the experiences, it comes from your life, it comes from more than just like, what you're taking in, where you're in that space right now. So, it's don't ever apologize always be critical. And I'm sure you encourage your students to be critical too, and the world needs us so yes don't apologize. Thank you, thank you thank you thank you. Anyways, I'll, I'll leave you to the rest of your meetings for the rest of the day. I hope you're able to rest on this Friday, and yes, if there's any other clarifications, I need would you mind if I reach out to you?

Maraj: I'm kind of sure and I'm hoping to reach out to some folks at music in the near future about something that we're, we're doing here UBC. So, I may be in your inbox within the next year about something else.

Interviewer: And also, I just want to let you know, I know that you, yeah just if you want to come into any of the workshops that are coming up in October, you're more than welcome to just come in as a participant. I can resend out the e-mail about the workshops and like the Zoom link if you'd like just in case if you happen to have a window and you just want to join the conversation so even though you're not interested you're more than welcome to be a participant.

Appendix B: Post-Secondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity

Panel Interview with Elizabeth Clarke, Learning Consultant, Academic Equity Programs (WLU); Dr. Nelesi Rodrigues, Assistant Professor, Institute for the Study of University Pedagogy (ISUP) (UT-M); Dr. Christin Wright-Taylor, Manager, Writing Centre (WLU)

Facilitated by Dr. Jason Collins (UVic) and Dr. Loren Gaudet (UVic)

September 25th, 2024

Interview Questions

- We'd like to discuss the institutional barriers students deal with – what experiences or insights do you have about these barriers? What have you done to support

students and perhaps (if you are comfortable discussing), what failures have you encountered (at the institutional level, pedagogy, structural, systemic)
- Given your technical expertise and experience building online resources for students, could you speak to how other institutions might think about creating these types of supports?
- Building off of the previous question, how has writing support (both courses and centres) exacerbated these barriers? Are there ways writing support has alleviated these barriers?
- If you had unlimited funds, what kind of training would be provided for writing staff or instructors with the specific aim to help empower multiply marginalized students (and, therefore, all students)?
- We are going to draft a position statement on writing, belonging, and identity in what is now called Canada. What do you think is crucial information to include in such a position statement?

Transcript

Facilitator 1 (Dr. Jason Collins): Okay, so, the first question we have on this topic of "Post-Secondary Writing, Belonging and Identity: we'd like to discuss the institutional barriers students deal with. Barriers that might impact this topic. What experiences or insights do you have about these barriers? What have you done to support students? And perhaps, if you're comfortable discussing, what failures have you encountered at the institutional level, pedagogical level, systemic level – at any level. So, barriers, maybe successes, failures… anything that you think you'd like to share on that topic, please feel free to raise your hand. Yes, Nelesi – am I pronouncing [your name] correctly?

Dr. Nelesi Rodrigues: *Nelesi*.

Facilitator 1: *Nelesi*.

Rodrigues: Yes. Yes.

Facilitator 1: Thank you so much.

Rodrigues: Thank you for asking this. Buenos dias and buenos tardes for me. Good morning to you. It's afternoon over here. And thank you to the Writing and Power team for the invitation. I'm really excited to be part of these conversations. My name is Nelesi Rodrigues. She her. I'm an assistant professor at the Institute for the Study of University Pedagogy at the University of Toronto-Mississauga, and I am also… I have a joint appointment at OISE [Ontario Institute for Studies in Education] in the program of Adult Education and Community Development. I'm also a newcomer to this land. I grew up in

Caracas, Venezuela, and spent the last 10 years in the United States studying and teaching. And I came to what is now known as Canada last year. And my research is in embodied rhetorics and pedagogies, transnational feminism, and community learning and writing. And I… if that's okay, just for the sake of not taking too much time, I'm going to rely on my notes just to be direct.

And so, when thinking about this question, I think that the first barrier that came to mind is what we often refer to as the hidden curriculum, right, that historically marginalized populations need to learn in addition to whatever it is that they are studying – and the role that the universities can play and help them navigate that hidden curriculum. I had the opportunity to be a graduate student in two different institutions in the United States, and the difference in experience of having staff and faculty members who were very aware of the challenges that I might be facing, versus a university that wasn't so aware because they didn't have such a large international student population, was huge. And I think this also applies to undergraduate students. And so, you know where some students might have access to key information about how to navigate academia, be it parents or close networks, others might not. That privilege.

And I also think that oftentimes these same populations might have less traditional educational trajectories. This might mean that they might be juggling other responsibilities in addition to their learning, such as caretaking of elders or children, they might be working one or multiple jobs at the same time that they are studying, they might be homesick, in the case of international students. And these realities might limit the time and the energy that they might have for learning and getting involved in different activities that would ultimately help them cultivate this sense of belonging and identity within the university.

I think one of, or a few of the things, that I have done in my work that responds to these two barriers that I see – there are others, but I also don't want to take up too much space – but the things that I have done come from my work. My research is mainly in pedagogies and learning in non-formal spaces. So, many of the interventions that I have implemented in my work are connected to community-engaged and community-accountable pedagogies. And so, I'll just give a few examples:

So, in the first-year writing course that I currently teach, I deliberately introduce course concepts in experiential and culturally relevant ways. And I use these opportunities to connect students with different university resources. So, for instance, next week, we're going to begin our unit on discourse communities, and the organization's students for barrier-free access at the University of Toronto are going to come to class to talk about their work as we also engage with their work as a case study for discourse communities. So that's one thing.

I am also currently developing a community-engaged writing course for undergraduates with a thematic focus on mobility justice, and in this course students will have opportunities to hone their collaborative writing skills as they co-develop resources with community partners that are doing advocacy work on mobility justice from different perspectives, including migration, ageing, and accessibility and transportation.

And lastly, I want to also mention that I'm involved in a couple of initiatives in my department that support students' identity and belonging. We are right now in the early stages of our program-wide assessment that will give us a deeper understanding of the impact of the first-year writing program in several areas, including how our courses are contributing to equity, diversity and inclusion on campus. And this year, I'm also one of the faculty club facilitators of a space called the Caribbean and Black Writing Collective, which is an initiative that started before I arrived at UTM, but that continues up until now. And it's a space where students can develop their writing and university skills in a culturally affirming setting while building relationships with peers, faculty, and staff, and establishing formal and informal mentorship networks. And I'm going to pause there for now, but I would be happy to discuss any of those in more depth later.

Facilitator 1: Thank you so much. That like… so many wonderful things going on there. I think we could talk about those things for the rest of the workshop. It's wonderful. And hopefully we'll have a chance to talk about some of that in the breakout rooms. Elizabeth: I see your hand up.

Elizabeth Clarke: Thank you so much. I'll let Christin just introduce us, and then I will jump into answering the question. Christin, if you'd like to go.

Dr. Christin Wright-Taylor: Yeah. So, hello everyone. I'm Christin. This is Elizabeth. Elizabeth will introduce herself more thoroughly, but we work at Wilfred Laurier University in the Student Success Division. I manage the writing centre. Elizabeth works with the transition and learning services. And the reason why we're here today is because she and I collaborated together to create a translingual academic writing bank. And so, we'll talk more about that and our experience of putting that together, but I just wanted to sort of frame that we're coming from outside the academic… we're actually organized under student affairs. So we have a slightly different angle approaching this work. So our division, our unit, reports to the VPSA. So anyway, I'll leave it at that and let Elizabeth take it from here.

Clarke: Thank you. So, to introduce myself, my name's Elizabeth Clarke: pronouns she her. And so I work at Laurier as a learning consultant. So my role is to support students in developing essential learning and study skills for success on their educational journey. So I

really work in collaboration with our transition learning services, which is our student success department, but also our Centre for Student Equity Diversity and Inclusion. And so a part of my role is really managing the equity – sorry, the academic equity programs. And then I also focus on student success. So that's helping them overcome barriers to education and transition support. And so, this really is to assist students in adjusting to their new academic environment while I also serve as a resource for equity-deserving students or marginalized students, helping them to identify their learning needs and offering culturally relevant but also holistic academic support and programming. I also want to add that my background is within social work, so in some of the other roles that I've done that has allowed me to collaborate with Christin, but also being in this role is, you know, working within research and child welfare and working within homeless shelters, and things like that – working with children and families. So that really is the kind of... background that I bring to this and kind of the lens of really working to support equity-deserving students.

And so, when I also thought about this question, I first thought of it... or, I first thought it was important to acknowledge, you know, the historical background. So, when thinking about marginalized students and the challenges that they face, there's many barriers that they face in post-secondary education as we know. And so again, that's really deeply rooted in historical contexts of, really, the legacy of slavery and white supremacy. So I wanted just to briefly mention that and then get into some... listing some of the other barriers. So, when we're thinking about the institution of slavery and contextualizing this within North America but the United States more specifically, slavery, you know, started early 1600s, so they say, until the 19th century.

And so, when I'm really thinking about the way in which slavery has worked and the way in which it has dehumanized Black and Indigenous individuals, right, as well as many other marginalized groups, enslaved folks were denied basic rights. So that included education. And so, when we're thinking about folks being able to access this and thinking about the ways in which being able to access education really poses a threat to the system of oppression, really, right? Because if you were literate or if you had knowledge, then you would be able to, you know, advocate for yourself, fight for yourself, a be able to question the things that are happening.

And so when we're thinking about or talking about the abolition of slavery – and I like to use air quotes, the “abolition” of slavery – systemic racism continues, right? And so, it's continued at that time of abolition through Jim Crow laws, segregation, and various forms of discriminations. And again, these are the ways that it has created barriers that continue to impact many folks, but really when we're thinking about the educational access to

school through generations. So that generational impact and trauma that that has created. And so, then, when thinking about white supremacy and how that has continued to shape the educational structures and policies in which a lot of us are working within, often privileging white folks or white, white individuals while marginalizing students of color, Indigenous folks, Black folks as well, and other historically oppressed groups. So the legacy continues to manifest in various ways in full secondary education. And so that really leads me to talking about some of those barriers.

So when we're thinking about bears to post-secondary education, I think it's important to again kind of bring it back and think about, okay well, there's a lot of barriers that they're facing before they even get to post-secondary education, and they're facing many challenges through their K to 12 years, right? So when we're thinking about that – and I can share briefly about my background, working with youth involved in the elementary schools and the high schools – but there's educational inequities.

So sometimes… oftentimes, there's underfunded schools, and for many marginalized folks who are living in poorer areas and having poor access to resources and supports – those socio economic barriers, so poverty and food and housing insecurity, when we think about health and well-being, so there's limited or lack of access to healthcare and mental health services. But when folks do get that, because I get folks who often think "well, we live in Canada and you have free healthcare" and all these things, but we're thinking about medical racism and how that shows up for folks as well and having to go multiple times to readdress challenges or issues that they're experiencing. But then I think most importantly, limited or lack of support. So, lots of marginalized students, they may lack access to mentorship or guidance or networking opportunities, which really is crucial for navigating the complexities of school, the educational system, but let alone post-secondary education.

And so, I'll say briefly: some of my background is working with youth involved in the justice system, and in my time working with youth through, kind of, counselling sessions, a lot of times they're telling me that, you know, they don't have support or they don't have the caring adult that they can go to and ask for support. So those are just some of those challenges.

And then as we move to post-secondary and really thinking about that and what that looks like for youth moving from K to 12 to post-secondary, I think what's most important to acknowledge is the visualization. Many marginalized folks don't even envision themselves attending post-secondary education. I can say for myself as well, when I was graduating, and thinking about college or university, I also have a background in child welfare and being adopted and so as a result of that, I was like, okay. I'm definitely not going to school.

The stats say that, you know, folks from child welfare, that they don't historically go to school, right? They’re more likely to drop out and things like that. So, even for myself and visualizing that, I didn't see it as an opportunity.

And so, when we think about that again, there's also the lack of resources such as academic support, financial aid or information about college applications. So again, think about myself, I was adopted by a black family, but I would have been the first person to go to post-secondary, right? So when we’re thinking about first-generation students attending school, being able to have folks help me navigate through an application process or finding housing on campus or off campus and things like that, so I think that's really important to acknowledge. But really in that visualization, it creates a perception that post-secondary education is unattainable or not something for us, and that's very much what I thought. So even in accessing OSAP [Ontario Student Assistant Program] after and learning about that I was, oh, okay, there's a way for me to move through this.

And I'll just kind of say briefly, there's limited exposure. So again, not having role models or mentors to support them in navigating this, but also to see people have that visualization of other folks in these spaces where you can go and ask them for help saying, hey, how did you do it? Kind of question their experience so you better insight into that. I think really big in society right now is negative messaging. So when I think about the young folks and things that they're seeing, whether on social media, on TV and things like that, it really does kind of reaffirm these systemic barriers and societal stereotypes creating a narrative that higher education is not for them. And so, I think that really is challenging for young folks as they're trying to adapt through this world and finding their identity, figuring out who they are. And then also, you know, allowing themselves to engage in social media, which is a big thing for them at this age as well.

I think another one is financial constraints. So again, when we're thinking about folks coming from that low socio-economic background, right? It might be difficult to afford tuition, books, and other educational expenses. I know our previous panelist also noted social isolation or lack of belonging, and I think that's a big one for the students that I work in that they talk to me about, you know, not feeling like they have a space here, especially being on a predominantly white campus and trying to navigate that the best that they can in their classrooms while sometimes they're also facing, you know, really overt or sometimes subtle racism. And how do they have those conversations? If it's your professor, can you say something? Who do you go to? When we're thinking about some of those things, right? I think cultural insensitivity, so really understanding that educational environments are not always culturally responsive or inclusive. Again, if they're thinking about reporting this, “will I be believed or will someone actually advocate for me? Am I doing this by myself?”

And then I think just lastly: culture barriers. So really, when we're thinking about this, and I think this speaks overall to writing, sometimes the perception is that the dominant culture in higher education and sometimes writing often reflects white, middle-class values and perspectives. So then this really excludes folks, but particularly students from diverse backgrounds, from being able to engage in this or connect with their faculty or the curriculum or enter these spaces. That was a lot of talking, so thank you.

Facilitator 1: Thank you so much. Thank you. And then, I just wanted to invite… if you have something, Christin, you'd like to add, or we can, we can move on to the next question. Awesome. Perfect. So, Loren, I'm going to pass it on to you.

Facilitator 2 (Dr. Loren Gaudet): Great. Okay. Such fantastic, insightful answers from you guys. And I'm going to build off that set of responses and basically ask, building off the previous question, and these like great insights, how has writing support specifically – so both in courses and centres – exacerbated these barriers? And are there ways that writing support has alleviated these barriers? Yes, so. Any initial thoughts?

Wright-Taylor: Yeah, I can speak to the writing centre perspective. I'll just introduce myself quickly. So my name is Christin Wright-Taylor. I am American and married a Canadian, which is how I ended up in Canada about 10 years ago. I actually grew up overseas, until the age of 14. Although, everywhere I lived, I was always… I always got the chance to be educated in my home language of English. And I, of course, always showed up as white in those spaces the, you know, the colour of privilege, no matter where I was. But with that said, I did experience some culture shock, and I think the invitation to think of the world as a multicultural place and to… an invitation to think outside of my own, sort of, egocentric norms, and to sort of understand that American culture is just one of many cultures that inform the way people come into the world, and engage the world in education and um… I came to this work because I taught for many years first-year composition, like Nelesi, in the States and saw how international students were struggling with culture shock and transition and the chaos that ensues with that, as well as language barriers and trying to integrate into Northern American education. So, I brought that into my PhD work and studied how to support international students in the Canadian writing classroom, and so bring that research perspective into my work as a writing centre professional.

However, again I realize that as a white, well-educated woman, I embody white supremacy whenever I get in front of the room – whenever I'm the one talking, leading. And so, I have committed to actively staying aware of that and doing the inner work and the spiritual work. For me, it's very much connected to my spiritual journey as well. To reflect on that and stay open and to be as mindful as I can, and then also really decentre myself in this work and create space for others to come in and speak into it, and to collaborate with wonderful

people like Elizabeth as we try to create those spaces for students in the writing centre and the way that we teach writing. So that's what led to the start of the translingual academic writing bank.

So how is writing support in writing centres exacerbated these barriers? I think to build on Elizabeth's point of representation and visualization, students don't see themselves in the writing centre. They don't see themselves in the writing tutors. They see, sort of, traditional... They don't see themselves in the writing director. Like *me*. And so, it's really important for me to hire inclusively.

And so, we've been very intentional last couple years of overhauling our hiring practices and making sure that we have identified our outcomes for the learning... for the, for the interview process. We have a rubric in place. We're very strategic about where we promote: we promote through our accessible Learning Centre, we promote through CSEDI [Centre for Student Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion], promote through the Indigenous Student Centre [ISC]. Like, really reaching out to those populations. But I am a firm believer in relationships, relationships, relationships. And those things don't happen outside of the context of relationship.

And so, I, first and foremost, have been working to build those relationships with the leaders of ISC: the 10,000 cups of tea, just being consistent, showing up investing in relationships, being in the space, being willing to be *guests* in the space, which I think is something as a white person... we're so used to the institution being our space, and I really love bringing my staff and my tutors into spaces where they're not.... like, it doesn't cater to them. So having times when we are invited and able to go into the Indigenous Student Centre and feel that you're a guest in the place and practice being a guest in a space. And so... yeah. So, with that, we've been able to actually hire more inclusively and working on bringing in tutors that are more representative of the student body, which I think has been really helpful.

And then I think, part of how we alleviate these barriers is that representation: trying to hire intentionally and inclusively and trying as much as possible to give that space away to others and know that it's not just our space. We want it to be everybody's space. So there's more I could say, but I think I'll stop there because it might tie into some of the other questions.

Facilitator 2: Thank you, Christin. That's, yeah, really insightful. And I love the idea about just, like, thinking about that being embodied in the space and the role that space plays there. I think that's like, incredibly insightful. Nelesi?

Rodrigues: Thank you. I think... I was thinking, in relation to this question, you know... Elizabeth started her answer by reminding us that education has... exists within a context and has a history, and I think that this is also the case of writing centres and writing courses, which are closely tied to the moment where access to university education was expanded to minoritized populations or marginalized populations, right? And that connection isn't always... it's a complicated one. Because these spaces [writing courses and centres], for some time, were considered to be the spaces that would quote unquote "fix" students who didn't conform to certain expectations of what students should look like or sound like in the university. And so, you know, while writing centres and writing courses have vowed to support these new student population in their academic journeys, sometimes the support has pitted the learning goals that they have against their own ways of knowing and being and their communities, right? So,... this I think that even though so much has changed in both of these spaces and how we frame the work that we do, sometimes the legacy of this history continues to creep in our work as writing study scholars. And the community adjacent to that is to grapple with those legacies all the time and think about how we can undo them.

But I also think that at the same time that there's such history, there's a long genealogy of educators starting at that very same point who have resisted this deficiency paradigm. Right? And more so, you know, that that has only grown more richer and louder and diverse. And I think that if we look at contributions from fields that include new literacy studies, translingual pedagogies, anti-racist and anti-colonial pedagogies, community-engaged pedagogies, queer and feminist pedagogies, and disability perspectives, all of these have made it not only possible but *urgent* for us to reimagine writing classrooms and writing centres as spaces that do two things at the same time: make students resources so they can navigate institutions that are still largely white and male and ableist, and also become spaces where their identities are recognized and uplifted as they gain a better understanding of how... what the context of the history of their learning is. I'll pass the... I can talk about some initiatives that are writing specific that are happening at UTM, but maybe like in a second round about this question.

Facilitator 2: Thank you. That... Yes, that is such an important response. And yeah, we'll come back to you about specific initiatives. Elizabeth: I see your hand.

Clarke: Thank you. I actually just wanted to add something onto what Nelesi shared, actually. And when we're thinking about, I guess writing services or, just, academic writing conventions – and that's really what it was for me, with the last two, when you're talking about the goals – Christin and I, as we were writing the translingual writing guide, really spoke a lot about... kind of the impacts of the conventions not really aligning with diverse

linguistic backgrounds of marginalized students, right? And really how that creates – and I think for me in my work, I see this a lot – how this creates this pressure or reinforces feelings of inadequacy or imposter syndrome a lot of times. You know, students will be like, "I'm having imposter syndrome. Am I supposed to be here?"

And so, when I'm thinking about that, I think that's really one of the barriers to what... or, adding on to what Nelesi was saying about writing centres, but I think that I can only speak to my institution in working with Christin, but, the ways in which we're really working together to change these things or to improve the writing services or writing centres is to really collaborate, to really have more representation, to invite folks into the space, is what we've been doing. I think it's really working well.

But, quite frankly, coming to the space... So, Christin actually mentioned that she had herself and her writing centre, her coaches, come to an event that myself and some other colleagues who do this kind of EDI work with students, they came to the space, and they were actually, I think, probably the only white folks there, right? And they really had to kind of, you know, put themselves in this environment and maybe feel a bit uncomfortable, but also to do the work to kind of talk about it. And Christin did share with me that, you know, she spoke with her writing students to really talk about like, you know, us having a privilege and going into the space is a gift.

And so, I think those conversations have been really helpful for me even just to see, because I've also never seen myself in writing. And so when I see students and they come and talk about the challenges they're experiencing about writing centres and the services, I can understand where they're coming from initially. And so now that we have Christin in her position, it's great to refer them there. So I'm often doing lots of referrals there. So yeah, thank you for sharing that point, Nelesi. Really helpful.

Facilitator 2: Yeah, Christin.

Wright-Taylor: Thanks. I can't... For some reason I can't see my hand raise icon, so I'll just raise my real hand if that's okay. So yeah, I wanted to just touch on Nelesi's point about the academic voice and sort of the preconceptions of what that sounds like. And we know that that is a traditionally raced, gendered, classed voice, and so the writing centre... really, the position we're coming from is the belief that all students have linguistic capacities that can empower them and are an asset in writing academic writing and that they should be allowed to bring their cultural and linguistic diversity into their academic writing. And so that's what Elizabeth and I were working on, was naming that, calling that out and then compiling this bank of academic writing that does demonstrate that code meshing that Doctor Vershawn Ashanti Young talks about.

And we find ourselves in an interesting spot, though, in the institution, because we are not in charge of the curriculum and we're not in charge of training faculty. So we're in this weird place of, like, we're empowering the students and letting them know there's nothing wrong with you. You're not faulty, you're not broken. And yet what we hear back is, yeah, but my professor's still going to give… you know, mark me down. Because the assignments aren't actually antiracist assignments. They're not… they're not decolonized. They're not assignments that are taking their linguistic capacities into consideration. And so, it was kind of a tightrope we had to walk, Elizabeth and I, when we were putting this together because we know that faculty access our website. So it was like we're writing it for students hoping that faculty will read it and get ideas about how to redesign their assignments in a way that can account for where their students are at. But we also had to just… flat out at the bottom of it we created a section that was like "how to talk to your professor about this." And here's a template of an e-mail. If you wanna try to use code meshing in your academic writing, here's how to open that conversation.

So, it's a weird rhetorical situation that we're kind of in. But where I've landed in terms of training our staff and our tutors are agency, agency, agency. We can't control the faculty and their assignments. But we are here to help the students. We can let them know they're not dumb. We can let them know they're not broken. We can affirm their linguistic capacities, and then we can give them options, and we can show them how to navigate some of these embedded… did you call it the invisible curriculum, Nelesi? I like that a lot. Like, make that visible for them so that then they can make choices about it rather than internalizing false narratives about themselves. So, I think that's the best we've come up – *Hidden curriculum*. Thank you – that's the best we've come up with trying to, like, walk that balance here.

I also will say, I never anticipated when I took the job in the writing centre how much I would get a behind the scenes look at faculty and their curriculum [laughs]. I just thought I'd be working with students and I'm like, oh, we see a lot. We see a lot.

Facilitator 2: That's really, really fascinating, Christin. And Nelesi, maybe as in instructor you could weigh in about the other side of that? That would be fantastic.

Rodrigues: Yeah. I was actually just going to say that. That tension that Christin is talking about, it's very familiar to those of us who maybe tried to cultivate translingual orientations among our students. And what I would say… Or, and the conversations that I have with students, because, you know, students want and legitimately want to… like, that's a valid goal: they want to do good. They want to get good marks. And what faculty decide to do, it's out of our hands, really. But I tell them it's important for them to develop an awareness of this history and this context, so that when they feel that they have to write a certain way, it

doesn’t, as Christin says, it doesn't make them feel inadequate, that they don't have a place there. That they understand why they're being asked to write in that way.

And also too, I tell them that to have translingual orientations doesn't necessarily mean that you will always have to code mesh, which is like... I wish we could, we could do all that all the time, but you can also rely on your writing communities. You can.... You can use in your writing process... You can move through your, like, diverse linguistic repertoires, right? It doesn't necessarily mean that the end product has to look a certain way. And so, I ask them to just become aware of what... how they can really bring all of that to the writing process. I had a very interesting, interesting conversation with a student a couple of weeks ago where they were telling me that in their culture when a person's face turns green they're getting angry and as opposed to getting ill, right? We were talking about how, you know, having linguistic repertoires that are multiple, it's not only about the language in itself, it's a worldview, and that you can still, you know, fuse that worldview to inform your writing. So that's one thing.

And I also wanted to mention that the first-year writing course program that we are implementing, it‘s still in its rollout... But at UTM, the first-year writing program and the first-year writing course that we are rolling out, it's called “Writing for University and Beyond.” And this program, which is uses a “writing about writing approach,” emphasizes transferability, and it also prioritises the development of critical language awareness. As Shawna Shapiro has theorized it. But you know, like, I think that this course is interesting because it creates opportunities for novice writers to practice the skills required in academic settings and also to consider writing as a social practice that has a place beyond universities and the curriculum structure so that we can bring that into consideration throughout. So, it [includes] a writing story unit, a discourse community analysis unit, and general analysis unit. And they can, at each point... Well, the writing stories, it's a personal narrative. But then in the other two assignments, they can choose to look into the university or look out, right? And so, that also helped us to create... make space for students to bring, you know, the fullness of their identities into the classroom.

And in addition to that, we have the initiatives such as the Caribbean and Black Writing Collective that's out of our academic skills centre that I mentioned already. And there's also an initiative that sounds a little bit like some of the initiatives that Elizabeth is involved in. There's the Support, Engaged and Experienced UTM that's not tied to our unit in particular, but it's an access program and a collaboration between the University of Toronto, Mississauga and The Hill District schoolboard where high school students can take a few entry-level courses, and they count towards their high school degree, and they can also kind of like count once they transition, if they decide to come to UTM. And you

know, this week, this past week, at one of the events at the Caribbean and Black Writing Collective, we were really excited to welcome back some of the C students who are now coming as [word unclear] writers into the collective. And this is all to say that one of the things that I see as really essential to cultivate identity and belonging at the university is the need for articulation. Like, there are so many skills to… we can make interventions [word unclear], but the more we can deliberately link them, the more powerful they are going to be.

Facilitator 2: Absolutely. Thank you guys. I also just want to remind everybody who's listening as well that I see amazing stuff in the chat, and also that Google Doc is up. So if you have ideas or like contributions that you want to expand upon, I know people are in there. Just a reminder that you can take advantage of that. Thank you. I'm going to pass it over to Jason.

Facilitator 1: Yeah. Thanks. This conversation has been great. And I think this next question… Like, some of it, a few of you have already kind of touched on. I know Christin, you've touched on this next question with some of the things that you've talked about – that you have your folks in the writing centre do. But, let's be imaginative with this, with this one, right? So, if you had unlimited funds right, in a world where university was not tied to dollar signs, which it unfortunately is, what kind of training would be provided for writing staff or instructors – so on either side: the writing centre side or the instructor side – with the specific aim to help empower multiply marginalized students. So, if anyone has thoughts on… I know training is definitely a needed thing, right? Yeah, Christin.

Wright-Taylor: I can just give a quick answer off the top. Immediately it comes to me that I believe every… I would love to have every person who works in the writing centre and helps with multilingual writers to go on exchange and be in a place where you are the minority and where you are the guest in the room, where you don't know the cultural norms. Just to start to get a sense of what that feels like. Because I think when you're so used to being the majority, there are things you take for granted. You know, we can talk… I love that term "hidden curriculum" that Nelesi used. We can talk about it, but you don't understand what we're talking about if you haven't experienced the hidden curriculum somewhere else. And so I think if money was not an issue, I would send everybody on exchange.

Facilitator 1: Yeah. Wonderful. I think that would be great for everyone. I love how you talk about, like, going into spaces where you don't automatically belong – as opposed to spaces where you're… you are the default. Yeah.

Wright-Taylor: Yeah.

Facilitator 1: Yeah.

Wright-Taylor: And I wanna let Elizabeth talk, but I'll just add a little bit to that. So the ways in which I can do that, I've tried to do that. So, when I was teaching first-year writing, I developed relationships with our Intercultural Resource Centre (IRC) on campus. I taught at Gettysburg College in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and I would have every course I taught… we would have a collaboration with the IRC, and we would spend time in the IRC. And it was at their invitation because also we're taking up that space, and I'm very conscious of that. And it was remarkable to see how agitated the students would be – the white students. Because they genuinely just had not experienced that before. And how uncomfortable they would get. And to be able to unpack that with them of like, why is this uncomfortable? Well, you're not used to being the guest in the room and just being able to just sit and watch and let other people take up space and have space and bear witness to that, right? Bear witness to how they interact, how they're doing those things.

So, two things come to mind since coming here to Laurier. I had… So, Elizabeth and her colleagues did a Black culture night and very kindly invited the writing centre to come and promote our services and connect with their students. And so I took two writing tutors with me, and they went and they sat in the corner of the room at our little booth, and I actually didn't want them interacting because I didn't want us to take over the space. This was the Black students' space. It wasn't our space. We were guests there, so they just stayed and they were ready to interact as people came up to them. I went around to the tables and talked to people and, you know, made connections. And then afterwards I asked them, I said, how was that for you? And they were like, everybody should have to go to something like this where you're… where you're the only white person in the room. Like it was so interesting. It like made us totally understand how Black students may feel in an all-white classroom, and this sort of thing, right? Like making those connections.

Another thing that comes to mind was we had our… for the Indigenous Student Centre we've been cultivating writing drop-ins over the years and have gotten to the point now where we have Indigenous writing tutors who are dedicated to those spaces. But initially, we were just building the relationship, and I would have my staff go in and sit, at invitation, you know, and do those. And one of my staff came back and was like, that's not a very academic space because there was a conversation happening among the students about menstrual cycles and the moon. And he was like, trying to do writing drop-ins at the same, and he was sort of struggling with it. And he was like, it's just, like, it's not really a very academic space. And I said, okay, let's, let's unpack that. Let's stop right there. And let's talk about that. Why is that hitting you that way? What are your expectations about what an academic space looks like? How is that embedded into your cultural conditioning as a white person in higher ed, right?

And so, I think those things are so… Those conversations can't happen… I wanna say to all the white people in the room, I think those are conversations we as white leaders can have with our white staff, right? We can hold… We can start to help unpack some of those things and push them and help them really start to reflect on that and deconstruct where some of that is coming [from]. And it was a good conversation. When we were done, he totally was nodding his head, and he was like, I guess that if we are committed to doing decolonial work, this is what it means. It means having these conversations and looking at our biases and our prejudices. So, it was a fruitful conversation. Anyway, I say all that to say, examples of… If I could have every white person do an exchange, or be it a guest in the room or the minority in the room, I think that's what I would do with money. So, I'm done.

Facilitator 1: Thank you. Yeah, that's wonderful. Elizabeth. I see your hand.

Clarke: Thank you. Yeah, I really was just going to, kind of, piggyback off Christin, and thinking about whether exchange… I was initially thinking of an employer supported volunteerism, and so I know there are places that sometimes do that. They will pay their workers a part of their wage or their salary to go to other places to volunteer and do work. And I think that that's something that could be done, right? So, to give back to the community in ways that they may not be able to afford or contribute. You're still being paid for it, but you're giving your time, your services, your resources, but, quite frankly, you're really engaging and experiencing different cultures, different backgrounds, different folks who come from, you know, various walks of life. I think that really is the [unclear word]. And so, Nelesi said a couple of things earlier talking about, like, the worldview, and I think that when we're moving in certain spaces because we have a certain worldview that we are used to, we are comfortable with, and sometimes coming outside of that worldview is hard, obviously, because, you know, our privileges and the power that we do have and things that are allotted to us. But really, it is up to us to do that work to, you know, step outside of that and see what else, you know, other folks are experiencing. What else does this world have to offer? I think most importantly…

And so Nelesi also talk about how realigning these things and so, I think about that and community, and think about just the power that community has, right? To advocate or to do this work. It's much easier to do this work in community. And so especially the comments in the chat talking about advocacy and maybe with some of that being within that hidden curriculum, if we are doing this in community, right, we're supporting one another, we're being allies to one another, so it's, you know, a little bit easier when we're taking the pushback or the brunt from the institution, from the organization or from folks who have things to say when we know that we are in alignment together. We're in solidarity together to push forward a certain agenda, right? Whether that's decolonizing or

empowering or uplifting folks. And I think that really is the work that we're here to do and definitely can be challenging because people do have to feed themselves. People have to pay rent, and so there's so many other things. But again, I think we forget that we're stronger in numbers, and that we have the power. And the folks who are above us or the folks who are in these positions of power, they're not… They're there because of us. And so, sometimes I think we forget that we have the power, but we've given them so much power.

So I think it's about how do we reclaim that power for ourselves in the work that we're doing and to also transfer that onto our students so that they're also empowered as they're moving through the world – especially when I think about writing, because we have to write all sorts of things. And so, I think it's not just about in academics, but I think a lot of the work that I'm doing along with Christin is really helping the students understand that this goes much further than just academia or being in post-secondary, but something that you'll need to be able to read things, write things, send things back. So, yeah. Thank you both Christin and Nelesi for sharing your input. It's really helpful for me, even, just to think about. Appreciate it.

Facilitator 1: Yeah. Thanks so much. And Nelesi. Yeah, I see your hand.

Rodrigues: Yeah. This is, you know, one word I am sitting with after hearing both of you is *space*. What's the space that… where we do our work, that we occupy. And one of the things that I had written in response to this question was that I really think that, you know, community engagement, when done with intention and accountability, can be very powerful in instilling a sense of purpose and belonging in our students, but also in ourselves. Especially those of us who are faculty and staff who also belong to those historically marginalized identities. I think that thinking about how, you know, how we engage with communities that the university belongs to is important, and also even where we hold our classes, right? Not to put you in this spot, Loren [Loren Gaudet, Facilitator 2], but I recently read your piece with Lydia [Toorenburgh] about the course that you have been facilitating, and I thought, you know, it's it was so powerful that move to have it in the First Peoples House. And I think there is a shift… Every time I take my students outside the classroom, they really, like, light up when they see and can talk about writing happening in specific places and doing things, right? So that that would be one thing, I think, connected to space. So training on how to do meaningful and accountable community engagement work.

I also think, you know, I really appreciate that you started this workshop talking about a trauma-informed approach and, you know, from the legacies of residential school to slavery to, you know, a pandemic that's still ongoing – I have so many students falling ill

right now with covid – to multiple [word unclear] unfolding, I feel like our students are coming to our classes heavy. We are also doing that. And I think developing trauma-informed approaches to writing pedagogies is key to this goal of identity and belonging, so that would be another area.

And lastly, I think, training on anti-racist and accessible assessment. I find that assessment is one of the areas where we find it the hardest to do away with the legacy of standardized English. And training might do a little bit in helping us just shift our attitudes about how we assess our student work.

Facilitator 1: Thanks so much. Oh. Yeah. Christin?

Wright-Taylor: So yeah, I'll just add that in terms of what we do with our tutor training is we bring in some of that translingual academic writing, and I like to... We do a full week of training before the term starts, and we do a few sessions on working with translingual students. And what I like to do is use Doctor Vershawn Ashanti Young's article "Should Students Use They Own English?" And he writes it completely in Black Vernacular English. And so, we read a portion of the article, and then I lob them the question, is this academic writing? And then we just spend the time discussing and unpacking it. And then that leads into talking about helping them to sort of see and think about the social norms around academic writing as culturally based, and also rooted in white supremacy and colonialism, and then we have further trainings, and then we continue to do it throughout the year. We have 12 professional development sessions throughout the year for our tutors, so we bake it into some of those sessions as well to continue to think about and talk about how do they then support students because, as we said earlier, the tutors always come back with "but what if the students want to write in standard English?" Because, as Nelesi said, something they do. They want to just... they wanna write to get an A. They wanna check all the boxes. And also, "what do we do if that's not what the professors are asking them to do?" So then that's when we really focus on the agency part of it and being a cultural informant and a literacy broker for students.

Facilitator 2: So powerful you guys. This is fantastic. Yeah, so many good phrases coming out. I've just been, like, taking notes, and yes, I love this and thank you so much for that kind shout out. That's so exciting to me that you read that article. Yes. Okay. So, our last question, which is, I mean, excellent time management everyone! Really well done. We are... In the next portion of the workshop one of the things that we're hoping to do with these sessions are to draft some position statements. And so, the question that I would put to you guys now is: we are going to draft a position statement on writing, belonging, and identity in what is now called Canada, and, basically, what do you think is crucial information or points? What is crucial to get into that position statement?

Wright-Taylor: You're asking us that question or are we working on…?

Facilitator 2: I am, yes. I'm asking you that question. Sorry Christin. Yes, that's my final question for the panelists: if you had to, like, highlight some specific "must includes" in a position statement, what would they be? Thank you. Elizabeth?

Clarke: Yeah. When I think about it for myself, I think about really including, like, a historical context to it, I think, right? And I think, obviously being based in Canada is definitely most important, but also like just a worldview of thinking about the ways in which many different countries around the world have had a long history of slavery, right? And I think a lot of times we don't talk about that. I think folks just think about the British Empire, United States, things like that, Canada. But it really does run deep, and I think it's challenging because this literature isn't always available. So, including a historical context will really be helpful for folks to really kind of set the tone for, you know, why this conversation is important, most importantly. And then. Yeah, I think, for now, just historical context for me at this point. Thank you.

Facilitator 2: Thank you. Nelesi?

Rodrigues: Yes, I absolutely agree with Elizabeth that opening with context would be really important. Especially to think about what… what is it about the Canadian context that might be different from other places. I also, you know, looking at the folder with resources that everyone contributed was so amazing, but something that was sitting with me was, I was like, oh, it seems from looking at the resources that there might be different understandings of what cultivating identity and belonging in writing spaces entails. And I think maybe that would be important to elaborate a little bit on. Like, all of those approaches might be necessary and important, but I think to talk about, maybe, those layers would be helpful.

And I also think it would be important to identify these scales, right? The scales for intervention. Just looking at the resources that were there, you know, there are things about writing centres, first-year writing courses, writing in the disciplines, and writing across the curriculum. Those are, like, areas. And then there's course design, including syllabi, assignments, assessment tools, class activities, course materials, instructor's positionalities. There's also co-curricular activities, and then there's writing research. I think like, there are, you know… There's so much to cover that I think it's important to name that the position statements are not going to do all the work. It's a first step, but I think that just to say, well, these are the areas people are working on, and there might be others as well, but we want to name them. So yes, that's… Those are my two things.

Wright-Taylor: And I think for me – this Christin speaking now – I think about the audience. Who is the position statement for? Is it for students or is it for scholars and faculty? And I think immediately, just given the positionality of my role in the institution, I immediately think of clear statements to the students. I don't know how to say this in a formal way. You're not broken. There's nothing wrong with you, you know. Trying to help them disrupt the myth of the ideal native writer. And kind of disrupt the internal narrative that somehow they're inadequate or lacking. So, if it were a student-facing position statement, I'd wanna state that and then cite the scholars who have done work to show that, like Paul Kei Matsuda and Suresh Canagarajah and Maya Poe and those people.

Facilitator 2: Nelesi?

Rodrigues: Yeah, I just... Something that Christin said also brought this to my mind. Elizabeth was talking about this at the beginning of the conversation. Is, you know, we were we're talking, in this panel, about student belonging and identity. But a part of that equation is also faculty and staff belonging and identity. And so maybe, kind of, put attention into that at some point in the statement? Or maybe that's, you know, that's a different statement, but I think, you know, it is important. It's so... I think it can be very powerful for students to be able to connect with faculty and staff whose experiences resonate with their own. And unless we make sure that those faculty can feel at home in the university, they are not going to find them. And we also need to make it so that they are not overworked and, you know, have time to engage with their students.

Facilitator 2: Thank you. Yeah, those are... I mean... Yes. You have, like, accurately complexified the need for this position statement by being like "hey, multiple position statements?" So that is a very... I hear you. And then there's a really excellent question in the chat from [name]. So I'm going to read it to you. And this is like... We didn't send this in advance, so I'm sorry. This is on the spot. But [name's] question is: the discussion about students for whom English is not their first language, what are we saying about generative AI? And so I will put that into the chat. And so, if anyone... If you have any thoughts on that as well as a way to kind of end things off, that would be great.

Wright-Taylor: I do have thoughts, but I feel like I keep talking first. So Nelesi or Elizabeth, do you want to go first? Okay. So I – again, just my worldview perspective is working one-on-one with the students in the writing centre – what I find is it is the same old tired myth of the ideal native writer, quote unquote – well, that's the term that Paul Kei Matsuda uses – that has perpetuated this anxiety in multilingual students that they can't write. And I think for all students, that encourages them to try to find alternate ways to complete assignments or reach the goals that feel unachievable to them. It's those same old tired narratives in the institution that keep getting perpetuated, that push, in my experience,

multilingual students to use GenAI. And so the same things that always worked to help them embrace their strengths as writers, their linguistic capacities and capabilities, still work with GenAI.

And so, I will tell a story to back this up. I had a student who's from Nigeria last year who kept failing his assignments because he was using generative AI to write them. He's a health studies student. And the funny thing was, he wasn't coming to the writing centre till after he had written it and would get his grade and then he would come to us. And I was like, if you'd just come beforehand, then we can, like, work with you a little bit. So, finally, he figured out... The faculty kept sending him back to us. And when I really sat down to work with him on the assignment, what I saw was he was just a knot of anxiety around his ability to write. And he was so scared. And he'd so... Now the thing is, he's from Nigeria: English is his home language. But it's a world English, so he would write in Nigerian English, and he was very aware of the fact that Nigerian English didn't fit the norms of academic English. And so, through a series of writing strategies and exercises that we use in the writing centre, sat him down, worked through this with him, took off some of the pressure, gave him some writing prompts, did some free writing with him tailored to the writing assignment to allow him to just write in his voice, and to tell him, put down the burden of trying to write in academic English. Write in Nigerian English. It's okay. And then I'll help you from there. And then being able to affirm for him when he was writing in Nigerian English, this sentence, this paragraph actually really works. There's nothing wrong with it. It works. Now, make sure, your citations are right. Like, I'll teach you the citation thing. And then having a conversation – he gave permission for us to reach out to the faculty – having a conversation with the faculty on the other side of... he's been meeting with me faithfully. He's writing in Nigerian English. I'm making sure that it's correct. I'm making sure that he's addressing the assignment requirements to kind of give her context so she could take that into consideration when she's grading, right? And again, it's that sort of sly, like, we're not supposed to train the faculty. We're not supposed to... But kind of slyly trying to open her worldview too, to how she's teaching writing, and grading the writing. She's not a writing instructor. She was a Health Sciences instructor. And so, to come back to the question, I think the drive and the desire, in my experience, to use GenAI is coming from that same place that it's always come from that's a result of an institution that prioritizes and privileges, you know, a colonial white supremacist view of academic English.

And I'll just end with this little thing I saw in an article. I'll have to find the article and put it in here. But someone wrote "using GenAI in a writing class is like using a forklift in the weight room." Meaning you go to the weight room to build muscle, to grow, to get strong, and if you bring a forklift to it, you're not actually growing. You're defeating the point. And the whole reason why we ask students to write in class is because they're growing their critical

thinking skills, their reading skills, their writing skills. They're not actually building that muslce. And so I think helping students understand they don't have to rely on it to actually build that muscle. They don't have to rely on GenAI to build the muscle that they're being asked to build in their assignments.

Facilitator 2: Thank you. Nelesi?

Rodrigues: This type of question… I feel like this could be also another panel. But I'll say a couple of things. The first thing is that in my writing classrooms, I have started to operate from… Like, starting with transparency. So, I tell my students I would like you to restrict the use of GenAI to only prewriting, and we talk about what that involves. But I also would like you in your… at the end of your references section to include a statement of GenAI use. You tell me what you use, what you used it for, and what you did with the output after you got it. And something that I have learned is that anyone who's been under the impression that mostly multilingual students are using generative AI is wrong. Like, most of our students are using, you know, GenAI – for different reasons and for different purposes, but they are relying on it a lot. And I find that helpful because if I see how they are using it, I can tell them, well, you're using it for this thing and this is a skill that you're supposed to be learning here. Like, I want to balance this idea of, you know, write… learn to write in the classroom the way you eventually go on to write in your jobs and your other courses with, actually, I want you to develop the skills that you need to critically assess. If, like, when you're using GenAI, what is it giving you? And so, that's one, that's one way I'm responding to generative AI in the classroom in relation to equity and identity.

And the other thing that I'll say is I am part of a team of faculty and educational developers at UTM who have been working on a resource for faculty members to assess their own cultural biases when suspecting academic integrity violations connected to generative AI. Because I think that that's an area where we might encounter some assessment injustices being reinforced. It's not fully… it needs to be approved by several offices, and it's in the process of getting those approvals. But yes, that's an area that we're also kind of considering.

Facilitator 2: That's... I'm so excited about that initiative. That's like... As you were saying that I was just like shaking my head, like waving my pencil. Such a great idea! Okay, well, before we switch gears... First of all, thank you to all of our panelists for these amazing insightful responses. This has been so fantastic. Again there's the Google Doc. If you want to continue this discussion, feel free. You'll continue to have access to that. Again, that's totally optional, but it's there. Sarah put in the chat that we will be... we have a workshop on October 23rd about, basically, writing technology and accessibility, and I think we might include that fabulous question [about GenAI] in our discussion questions because it's super. And then I just wanted to quickly say thank you to our transcribers for being with us and doing that work with us. We're really grateful for your time and your expertise. So thank you for joining us today.

Appendix C: Writing and Working Conditions

Interview with Dr. Mark Blaauw-Hara, Assistant Teaching Professor, Institute for the Study of University Pedagogy (ISUP) (UT-M); Dr. Julia Lane, Writing Services Coordinator (SFU)

Facilitated by Dr. Jason Collins (UVic)

Editorial note: there were two other interviews conducted but both participants asked that their transcripts not be published, and their names be redacted. Any contributions from those interviewees have been anonymized for their protection.

Interview Questions

- What do you see as the biggest impact of precarious working conditions on teaching writing studies?
- Writing is primarily taught by precarious academic workers. How can writing programs and administrators create working conditions that build community, safety, and security?
- Most institutions in what is now called Canada are unionized. How can writing programs and centres work with unions to better support staff and instructors?
- What steps might administrators take to secure the resources necessary to operate underfunded and undervalued writing programs?
- Writing centre staff often lack academic freedom. How might that lack be an issue and how can associations, unions and other support mechanisms assist writing staff in this regard?

- Does writing studies in what is now called Canada suffer from lack of academic identity exacerbated by precarious working conditions and even deprofessionalization? If so, what thoughts do you have on a solution?

Transcript

Facilitator (Dr. Jason Collins): Okay. So, the first question on post-secondary writing and working conditions, we'd like to know what do you see as the biggest impact of precarious working conditions on teaching writing studies? So, what are some of those main impacts on our work that we do teaching writing in this often precarious position?

Dr. Mark Blaauw-Hara: Yeah, I'm happy to start things off. And I do look forward to hearing what Julia has to say, though, because I did want to mention that we come from some just different roles within our respective universities, and so our perspectives might be a little bit different. And so, I look forward to learning from her as well as just participating in this awesome series.

So just briefly about my own perspective, this is my fourth year in Canada at the University of Toronto-Mississauga, and what we're trying to do at UTM, as we call it, is to have one of... not the only, but one of Canada's few required first year writing courses for all incoming students that everybody who comes to UTM would take prior to graduation. So that's a new thing for us, for sure. It is... As some of the introductory materials in the packet mentioned, it's pretty common in the United States, which is where I'm from, but it's rare in Canada. And so, this is my fourth year. During most of that time I have been the coordinator for that first-year writing course, which currently is required of about 50% of the incoming students at UTM.

Prior to that, in the States, I worked for 20 years at a smaller college, where I was the writing program coordinator for our writing program, which included first year writing as well as what we call developmental or basic writing, which would be, quote unquote, pre-college writing. And then I also served as the Vice President, President, and immediate Past President of the Council of Writing Program administrators, which technically is an international organization for writing program administrators, but in practice is overwhelmingly an American organization. Again, partially because it… writing programs of the type that are kind of addressed like first-year writing professional writing type programs are more common in the US. So anyway, that's the perspective that I'm coming from.

And with both of those professional contexts as well as my position as the former president of that organization, this issue of contingent workers and, you know, precarity was really front of mind for all of us, and it continues to be in my current position. It's absolutely true, as was said in the in the blurb, that these programs and the courses

they're in, are really overwhelmingly staffed by folks who are hired on a course by course basis. And that has a really big impact on what you can do with those programs as well as the students as well as, of course, the faculty who are teaching those courses. And so, I do have some initial thoughts. I know Julia and I both, kind of… because we're nerds, we pre-wrote all kinds of ideas that we want to be sure to talk about. I do, Julia, want to be sure not to talk for too much of this hour and be able to pass it on to you.

But just to start things off, some of the impacts that these precarious working conditions have on the teaching of the writing studies, one of the big things is, and this is not going to be a surprise to I don't think any of you, but learning to teach writing well is an iterative process that is, of course, informed by scholarship. But it's also informed by practice, and it's informed by the lore that you would pick up from working within a vibrant community of other people who are teaching writing. And so, for those folks who are hired on a, you know, a contingent term by term or course by course contract or even a little bit longer, like a two year contract where they don't know if it's going to be renewed, it makes it more challenging for them to teach a good writing course, especially because what it means to do a good job teaching a writing course is like… it's place dependent, you know? Every writing program is going to have its own philosophy, its own way of approaching, you know, how to teach students, how to function within the particular university that they're in. And that university or college that the students are going to come into has its own particular demographics, its own pressures, its own courses. UTM is very different from even the, you know, downtown St. George campus of the University of Toronto. And those are very different from, you know, Winnipeg or what not, you know, like, these are all just very different locations. And so, if you're a faculty member who's trying to piece together a living by teaching course at a lot of different areas in a lot of different colleges, then you're having to shift your teaching philosophy, sometimes fairly radically, as you move from institution to institution. And it becomes difficult to get really good at addressing the needs of the student population in that institution. I'm… I noticed here… [*referring to the Zoom chat*] the context. Yes, BC is, for sure, ahead of Ontario in terms of first year writing courses. And so, I did want to acknowledge that. So thank you for the correction. One of the things… I'm going to talk about a community of practice in response to the next question. So, I'm going to elide that a little bit right here, but if you are moving in and out of these different teaching locations and different universities, different colleges, it becomes difficult to join that community of practice as well as contribute meaningfully to that community of practice. And so, that precarity impacts the instructors there.

And then, from a writing program administrator, a writing program coordinator's perspective, as I have been for close to 24 years at this point, I find myself asking myself how much work is reasonable to ask of contingent instructors. And how much support is

necessary for those contingent instructors. They require a different level of support than somebody who has been teaching in the program for five years or 10 years. And so, as you are, you know, coordinating a writing program and thinking about, let's say, a mid-semester professional development workshop, it becomes very challenging to plan that and make, like, just one workshop that is going to be genuinely useful to everybody across that program when people have such, such different levels of experience and such different needs. And then on that question of like... that I ask myself: how much work is reasonable? You know, I ask myself, like, how much benchmarking can I ask people to do if they think that they are... or if they anticipate that they're only going to be teaching one course for us, you know? If we are doing a... Like, we have a writing about writing pedagogy. that draws heavily from teaching for transfer curriculum. That's really different from, like, a first-year writing course that is really rhetoric based, let's say, you know? And so how much pre-reading can I ask new faculty members to do, you know of, like, kind of the fundamental scholarship in that area? These are things that I don't have easy answers for. And I find myself changing all the time, you know, what I ask instructors to do.

But it would be a lot easier for everybody involved if we had writing programs that were overwhelmingly staffed by faculty with continuing contracts. You know? It would be a different program. And I think it would be better for the students, it would be better for me – it would decrease my workload. And then also I think it would be a lot better for the faculty members. That's what UTM's program was originally designed to be. When it was proposed, it was supposed to be taught almost entirely by faculty with continuing contracts. When I applied for the job and got this position that was still the intention – was to increase those continuing contracts dramatically year by year. And then the university decided with some changeovers in leadership that that was not a priority for them anymore. So, at this point, we find that we are staffing more and more courses with contingent labor. So, I don't mean... Julia and I traded emails and she said that when she wrote out her answers, she got very sad and depressed. So don't worry. There's going to be some positive things, I think, that both of us are going to be talking about but. But it's, at least for my first answer, the biggest impact of precarious working conditions, I think it's bad for everybody. So, all right. Moving on to Julia. What do you have to say?

Facilitator: Yeah. Thanks, Mark.

Dr. Julia Lane: Thanks Mark. Yeah... I'll start by introducing myself. My name is Julia. I use she/her pronouns. I am... My background is Irish and English and Scottish, and I'm doing a lot of work right now to learn about that because I don't really have a lot of sense of where my people come from. I liked how Danica introduced her parents. So, my mom is Dawn. She grew up in the US. In Clearwater, Florida and in Alabama. And my dad is Steve. And he

grew up in Ontario, which is where I was born as well. And then I moved out here. I now work at Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, and I struggle with all those names because this place is not British or Colombian and Simon Fraser didn't create this university, and it's not his land. So, I am here in shared territory of the Musqueam, Squamish, Tsleil-waututh and Coquitlam First Nations. I want to shout out my earrings. These earrings were made by Alysha Collie, and I'm going to throw a link in the chat to her linktree in case folks want to check out her work. She's a storyteller and filmmaker and beader. So I'm just going to put that in there. Thanks, Heather [responding to the Zoom chat]. They are amazing. I got them this summer. My parents got them for me. So that, just to give you a little bit of sense of me and where I'm coming from.

So, I work in the… we call it here a Student Learning Commons. And so, it's a writing centre… Because I'm writing, am involved in the writing centre, I call us the "writing cente plus" because I'm very, like, writing-centric. I'm sure my colleagues think of us as like a Learning Centre plus writing, but… So we all situate each other as the add-ons. But yeah, so we do writing support and English as additional language support and learning strategy support for the university. And I started working here when I was a graduate student finishing a PhD in arts education on semester-by-semester contracts. And then I graduated and came back to work in a three-year term contract as a writing services associate. And right after I finished being in that associate position, they decided – the powers that be decided – that, actually, I had been doing coordinator level work which is like the next step up in the hierarchy. I had done it for about two-and-a-half years, almost the full three-year contract. And so, they posted the position as a coordinator level position. And they posted it at that time as a continuing. So, it had been a three-year contract, and then it became a continuing and one, sort of, step-up position, which was in some ways kind of validating but also, like, materially incredibly invalidating because I had done the job not in those conditions.

And it was a wild time. So that position was… When it was posted, I had actually interviewed for and gotten a coordinator-level position from a colleague that some folks may remember: Amanda Goldrick-Jones. I don't know. Maybe other people don't remember. To me, she was like a big deal because she was my teacher and my mentor, and she retired in December 2020. So, I took up this role in January 2020. And some of us may remember what happened in March 2020. And some of us may still be in a blur from that time. And so it was, yeah… Really wild. Yay! [*referring to the Zoom chat*] Katja, you remember Amanda? So, I frequently say I lost a mentor and gained a global pandemic. So it was really exciting for me to be taking on that role. And I kid not when I say that the closing date for the that coordinator position that they had created was the day the university shut down and went remote. And so, as it turned out, they were like, oh, we can't… Everything's

too "ahhhh" – there was a lot of handwringing, and so we just didn't. We just didn't. It just went on pause. And so, then I had two jobs. And for most of the time that I've been in this role, I've kind of been doing two jobs. And that... It turns out that's not great. I feel quite tired.

But... So, we went on hold from March 2020 until September 2020, and then we did ultimately hire. But, again, in a precarious... So, it had it had been intended to be continuing. We're not... Ah. So many details. But at that time, we were in the "APSA," which is the Administrative and Professional Staff Association in the university. So, this is why we use – we *don't* use the language of like tenure or anything like that because we were not in faculty lines at all. We were staff lines/positions. So "continuing" meaning, like, stable: stable employment. And then it was changed to be contract. I believe it was only a one-year contract initially. Possibly two.

And so, we did hire for that role, and we had someone in the position, and we did extend the contract a number of times. And every time the conversation came up about extending the contract, I tried to say we actually need to talk about this being continuing. Because that was the like the... We don't need an extended contract. We need a continuing role. But I didn't. I wasn't successful in that work of trying to make the conversation be about it being continuing. And so, in the more recent rounds of budget crisis and shenanigans, we have lost that position. So we are now from three down back to two positions in our centre focused on writing, and my colleague who is in the other role, the other continuing role, has been on leave for over a year.

So... Speaking from "I statements," I feel tired, and things are hard. And so, back to the question – that was just all introduction, everybody: who I am and where I'm coming from. And I will also introduce... I mentioned that we had been in the Administrative and Professional Staff Association [APSA], and we have recently moved from there into SFUFA. So, SFU Faculty Association. Confusingly, they're both called associations. APSA is an Administrative and Professional Staff Association. It is not a union. The Faculty Association *is* a union. So just to make it extra hard, we call them both associations, but one is a union. And that's why – in some ways that's why we were able to make the move. It's much more challenging if you're in an actual union to move to another actual union. So, I am going to talk a bit about that move and how that's impacted us and not impacted us. But I do want to say some of the things I wrote down.

So, in terms of biggest impacts of precarious working conditions... Like Mark was saying, I think there's so many biggest impacts that it's really hard to, like, even know what they all are because this is the water that we all swim in, and it's really hard to name the water that you're in. But I think that for me, and maybe this makes sense having just said everything I

said about what we've what I've experienced, the biggest thing that comes to my mind is just the perpetual losses that we endure. That I – and when I say we, I mean writing studies, I mean the profession, because I think the question kind of asks for that rather than just speaking about myself as an individual. So, we are losing people from our centres, we're losing colleagues who we have connections with and relationships with, and, along with them, of course, their knowledge and skills and experiences when they leave or are pushed out, right? When their contracts no longer exist, it's not even a choice to leave. And sometimes there is a choice to leave to look for more stable and supportive work. Who can blame anyone for that? And I think it's also important for me to name that even when folks stay, if they're staying in a precarious role and this, like, kind of perpetual contract renewal, there's what I came up with myself is this idea of a "slow leak effect" because of the precarious nature of the work. We/I/people in those positions, I don't think can invest as much of themselves into positions that are temporary because we're always on shifting ground, and so we don't feel the investment back to us, and thus it is vulnerable on an emotional and a practical level to actually invest of ourselves back into that role.

And then on a practical level, we might actually be like in the hustle, looking for other jobs. That means we've got other work going on, and so we can't just be 100% available – and not that anybody should ever have to be 100% available for your job. But even though the, like, whatever percent is for your job, there's a reduction in the percent that's available. And yeah, and then emotionally and psychologically, like we may also just be protecting our vulnerable selves from getting too attached to a job that... From everybody that I have connected with who's been in this kind of work, we love the work, we love being... the privilege of getting to work with writing and getting to work with each other. But then there's this feeling that, like, I might get too attached, and I might get edged out. This work might not exist for me, and that feels really hard emotionally.

And so, in addition to those like practical and emotional psychological "biggest impacts," I think that there's also structural and systemic biggest impacts that we have to think about. Recognizing that post-secondary institutions like so many institutions, maybe all institutions, are very hierarchical places. And I suspect that that may also be true where writing centres and writing studies exist outside of post secondaries – like community centres and in secondary schools and in public libraries – but I don't really know about those because I don't work there, so I will not speak to them. But if others have that perspective, I'd love to hear it. And so, there's like our individual precarity as people in positions that may not be adequately resourced, but then there's also the precarity of the actual writing studies department or writing centre within the larger institution. And those things can be correlated. So, the precarity of our spaces within the larger institutional ecosystem. But it can also be... So, like, we might be in a precarious space, with

precarious positions as a result of the precarity of the space and the under resourcing of it within the larger context. But sometimes we might have what feel like more stable positions as individuals – we have continuing roles or we're on the tenure-track line, or something like that – but that ground can still be really shifting because the actual space of our work within the institution is unstable, is under-resourced, is undervalued. And so, the whole bottom can drop out. And then we can be back into experiencing that precarity.

So yeah. And then the one last thing I want to say in answer to this question is, like, within that context of being sort of precarious structurally or systemically within an institution, even when we are able ourselves as individuals to invest more professionally in our work and our knowledge and our experience, that work and acknowledge and experience and credentials are often not situated in impactful ways within the university, which then decreases our ability to have a wider impact.

And so that's really very much on my mind right now with this transition that we've been making into the Faculty Association. And particularly because – and I'm not really sure if I'm allowed to talk about this, I don't think I've been told that I can't. But it's interesting how universities and… which make us feel like we should be silent. So, I'm not silent, but like, maybe don't go tell everyone. But at the bargaining table, the university has insisted on referring to us as "quasi faculty." And saying "yes, you can move into the Faculty Association, but you are not faculty. You are basically staff that we have moved into this union, and we will continue to treat you like that." And that's not been great for a lot of reasons. And, anyway, I don't want to get into all the weeds of that, but I'm happy to answer questions about it. But one of the really, really… One of the parts of that that has me really concerned is that in situating us like that, they are basically saying we will have no pathways to sit on Senate or the Board of Governors because we will not be occupying faculty roles – which have seats on those governing bodies and decision making bodies – but we no longer will have the pathway of sitting on seats that are for administrative and professional staff either. And so, we basically just don't exist in those structures of decision making and representation. And so clearly that's… It's concerning for us as individuals, but it's also, I think, the kind of pattern that we need to be on the lookout for in terms of losses in our field. Where are our perspectives and our credentials and our expertise being undermined or lost in the larger representation and decision making of these institutions that we work for. And, as a result of that, where are the students that we work with, their concerns and perspectives that we get first-hand knowledge of very often, *not* then also being brought forward. So, yeah. Without stable and respected roles within the university, we can't advocate for ourselves, we can't advocate for our field, and we also can't advocate for and with students. So, I think that's, for me, the biggest impact –

although I think there are so many. So that is… Yeah, that's my answer to the first question. Thank you.

Facilitator: Thanks, Julia, and thanks, Mark. Thanks for getting us situated both in what you do and in some of these impacts: systemic, personal workplace or working condition-related impacts. So, our next question is about what can we do, right? What are some things we can do. So whether it's a writing program administrator or writing centre director, what are some things we could do to create working conditions that build community safety and security? So, to Mark's point, some of the “upbeat” stuff, hopefully.

Blaauw-Hara: I think we can. I think, that most faculty members who are in precarious positions, I think, know that that's not my choice, you know, or anybody else in the… my – it's called the Institute for the Study of University Pedagogy – that this is not our doing. And I wanted to mention as well [*referring to the Zoom chat*], just about, like, silliness at the university: Sarah posted that teaching faculty were not allowed to be chairs or directors. Yeah, I'm a teaching-stream faculty member and, like, we have in our whole department, we only have 3 tenure-stream faculty members or research-stream faculty members and the rest of us are teaching stream, which is pretty appropriate because we are supposed to be studying and publishing about pedagogy, and then also teaching. And we're in this situation where we are not, by university policies, allowed to evaluate tenure-stream faculty members for things like promotion or tenure. And so, they have to bring in – for chairs of our department – they have to bring in people external to the department because we have so few people who are tenure stream in our department, which is just… We've had the good fortune of having some really great people, but it has been kind of a mess in terms of a process, and it's pretty nutty.

But anyway, back to the question here. So, I think transparency is the big thing. A precariously employed faculty member has just so much stress and insecurity that is just built into their situation that anything that we can do to make sure that what we have control over is as transparent as possible, I think is much appreciated and can hopefully reduce some stress and then hopefully help them feel… just good about their role. I have been experiencing something recently, because I'm cross-appointed to another department – and the individuals of that department are really wonderful to work with – but I have found it has – I only teach one course for that department – and I have found, like, just the questions of how do I get scheduled to teach it again for the following year? and when do I turn my syllabi in? and all that kind of stuff to be absolutely mystifying as somebody who is kind of only tangentially associated with that department. And that's been difficult for me as a human, but also really good for me as somebody who's a writing coordinator because it's helped me… It’s just reminded me what it feels like to be called in,

you know, to teach a course and just not understand a lot about how the department works or when you get this in or that in.

So, what I've tried to do… That experience inspired me to really put a ton of work into… it's called "Quercus," but it's just a variety of Canvas at the University of Toronto, to put a lot of work into our departmental Quercus shell. Lots of model assignments and syllabi and readings. And anytime we do a benchmarking workshop, I post those essays and the benchmarking materials up there and make videos about "here is how to set up your gradebook," and here is how to do this and just try to be as, like, forthcoming as I possibly can and not to guard materials in the ways that some faculty… You know, sometimes we think of our assignments as our intellectual property and we're reluctant to share those things. I just try not to do that and to encourage other people not to do that. And then to try, again, to be as transparent as possible about, like, when hiring happens and how scheduling happens and how to request courses. Which… Those particular things are not done entirely by me. They're done by other folks who work within my department, but just trying to make sure that it's really, really clear. I put together an FAQ document about, like, how do you do all of that kind of stuff and posted it up on the Quercus site and let people know about that. How to turn your grades in, things like that.

And that ties into my next point about… I think it's good for us to ask ourselves how can we build,, like a really expansive resource system? Because, for sure we want to do onboarding. But you can't always… You know, like a three-hour onboarding session is just not going to address every question that somebody's going to have. And some of those questions come up at, you know, 9:00 at night, right after they get a question from a student. And so, how can we get together a really understandable asynchronous collection of resources as well as making sure that they know that I'm available to ask specific questions of.

Another thing that I think about, I noticed in the packet of materials that everybody got there were several citations of Louise Wetherby Phelps, who is just a luminary in terms of a scholar about writing programs. I had the good fortune – she's done cross-border, you know, scholarship with Canadian and American writing programs, along with Jennifer Clary-Lemon, who's also cited in your materials. But anyway, Louise was my dissertation supervisor, and I had the good fortune of taking several courses from her too, and including one on writing program administration. And she introduced me to the work of Karl… I don't…. I would pronounce his name *Weick*: W-E-I-C-K. I have some resources that I'm going to share with everybody at the end of this. But Karl Weick talked about organizational improvisation in this reading that Louise shared with us, and that really struck me. And it's

something that I've carried with me for years, as I think about how to support people who work in the writing programs that I coordinate.

So, he was – or *is* – an organizational theorist, and he had this analogy that maybe really struck me because I'm a musician. And he said that good organizations should be able to function like basically a group of jazz musicians who are jamming. And so, he said that in a jazz ensemble, everybody knows – like when they're playing a song – everybody knows the basic structure of that song. So everybody knows what key the song is in; everybody has probably heard that song before, and just has just a sense of, like, on a macro level, what that song needs to do. And yet, very rarely, are people's individual parts dictated within that song. Instead, there's this ebb and flow that happens. This give and take. This communication that is happening between the different musicians. And they're building something new every time that they play that song. That song is not played the same each time, even with the same musicians. And that's one of the most exciting things about jazz music. And I would expand that beyond his... beyond jazz and say that as a musician, I've experienced that in rock formats or other sorts of improvisational music, you know. And it's super fun and super gratifying as a musician to be in a situation like that where you know that your quote unquote "voice" is going to be respected. It's nerve wracking to try to think of what you're going to play in a given moment, but it's also fascinating and fun, and, I hope, when it works well, it's great for people who are listening to it too. And Karl Weick said that we should think about organizations in that way.

And I try to think of writing programs in that way. So I try to think, like, what is the structure of the song that we're trying to perform in a writing course, let's say. What are, kind of, the key elements of it? I personally have found threshold concepts to be really useful as I think about that because threshold concepts, by their nature, are these gigantic, you know, big ideas. And so, you know, what are some of the threshold concepts that we want our students to engage with over the course of a term? What are some of the key readings or the key ideas – discourse communities, rhetoric, genre analysis, things like that – that we want our students to engage with in that semester? And then trying to help all the instructors, including those who are contingently employed, understand, like, this is kind of the song that we are trying to play, but that there is room within that song for people to improvise and for people to bring in their own perspectives – the readings that they love teaching methods that they love, that maybe have worked well in an entirely different program that was at an entirely different institution, or that maybe are developed in response to questions in the moment that students have or something that they notice on an essay, you know? So how can they improvise within their courses, and how can I as the coordinator let them know that those improvisations are not just respected, but that they're welcome?

And so, I think that some concrete ways that we can do that – in addition to just talking about those metaphors and making sure that appropriate materials are accessible to faculty within that program about, like, you know, rhetorical genre analysis. What is that? How can you read some scholarship on it? And if you have time, how can…, you know, what are we trying to get at?

Well, some concrete ways to do that that I think work all right is to… When we just revised our curriculum to… We were trying to make it more actively antiracist about a year ago, when we revised that curriculum. And so, we got away from a textbook, and we brought in some readings that we had found. But then one thing that we also did was we created – this smaller team that I worked with – we created rationales and explanations for all of our major essays. So rather than saying "faculty, you must have these readings that are in every essay and there's no flexibility for you" or "you must have these assignments and there's no flexibility," we tried to really pare down the readings that people had to require. So, we said, you know, here's three readings that we want you to pick two out of that are required for this particular essay. We've also put together kind of a grab bag of about six other readings that we think would work well for this essay, and you can pick from those, or you can bring in other readings that you have found that work well. But we want you to keep in mind this larger rationale for what we're trying to get at for the essay. And so, we wrote up, you know, they're about a page and half, really instructor-facing rationales for just theoretically and then practically here's what we're trying to get the students to engage with. And here's what we're trying to get the students to think about as they write this essay. How might you do that? You know? And so, the idea behind those materials again is to help the faculty who have just joined the program, as well as continuing faculty, help them understand what the song is that that particular essay is. And then like, what are the areas that they can improvise with their teaching, and how can they bring their own expertise and their own knowledge in?

And then also to make sure that the faculty know that we are not just, you know, I don't know… doing that to feel good about ourselves, to have teaching showcases that happen where those contingent faculty members, as well as you know, continuing faculty members, are invited, if they want to, if they feel comfortable, to share activities that they have done in the class that that they think have worked well. So, for instance, we had a number of them that happened last year where faculty members were bringing in ways that they have taught the students about discourse communities, code meshing, ways that they have… One thing that we've been hitting really hard is linguistic equity. Nelesi Rodrigues was one of your guest speakers in the last session. She's one of my colleagues who has been a wonderful contributor to our understanding as a department with linguistic equity. We also have some other faculty members who are much more expert than me on

this, but... So we had people coming in and talking about how they had drawn YouTube clips from Bollywood movies or, you know, how they taught their students rhetorical genre analysis with film... I can't even remember what they're called, but like on Netflix, where you're considering watching a movie, and they have the picture of the film, and then they have a description of it. You know, how can they tell what type of film, and, you know, stuff like that. And so, these are fascinating things that I wouldn't have thought of. And it's a way to just reinforce that contingent faculty, that their expertise is valued, that they don't have to move in lockstep with me, let's say, okay?

And I think that things like that lead to developing a robust community of practice within a writing program. And then I'm drawing, you know, from Lave and Wenger, you know, this concept of “communities of practice” where people are really sharing the ways that they approach, you know, getting something done. And that they are legitimately contributing, even if they're on the periphery of that community of practice, which I would say that somebody who's new to a program is more on the periphery of that community of practice. How can they legitimately contribute to that community?

Additionally, this might sound kind of funny, but any time that we have projects or committees, I try to make sure to let sessional faculty members know that they are welcome to serve on those committees and that they are... You know, sometimes I'll reach out if I know that somebody has expertise or interest in a particular area that I think would fit well. I'll reach out to them. For example, right now, again because of some leadership changeover, we've been experiencing some pressure to justify that our first-year writing course actually works. Like what's it doing? What are the students experiencing? Do they write better? Does the, quote unquote, “small class size,” which I still think is too big, of 25 students, does that produce connections between students and help lead to increased student retention and stuff like that, or help their transition into the university? And so, it's this very big, sprawling research project that we did all year last year and we're doing all year this year, and it has a lot of different areas, and I want to make sure that faculty members who are sessionals or on limited appointments, know that they're welcome to participate in these if they have the time and if they want to. And we have had a number of faculty members in those situations volunteer to be part of those. And I try to find ways, working with them, for them to participate, that just respects that they might not have a ton of time or they may not want to give us a ton of time. And then after they participate, I try to use my institutional cachet to write them really, really thoughtful letters of appreciation that they can use in their file, and I also reach out to them and let them know – in a way that I hope is very positive and appreciative – that I understand that probably they don't see themselves as being in this sessional job, teaching one or two courses for us, forever, and I let them know that I really appreciate their work, and if they ever need a letter of reference

or, you know, they want me to be one of their references that I would say glowing things about them. And I have had faculty members, both sessional faculty members who have gone on to be LTAs and continuing status faculty members who just have not felt as though their skills have really been utilized by my department, who have gone on to get jobs at other institutions, and I have gladly served as their reference, and I'm really happy that they have gone on to get other positions.

I think that one of our... If we are in the happy circumstance of having any sort of institutional power, I think we have a huge responsibility to just recognize that contingent workers who work with us, we need to recognize that they... Even though we want to make the best possible working conditions for them that we can, it's still not a good working condition for them. They need to... They want to move on, okay? And so, what can we do to make it easier for them to move on and get the types of jobs that are going to respect them and help them have some security in their lives and help them feed their families. That, I think, is a responsibility that we have. So how can we help our contingent workers gain experience in ways that will help them get other jobs. I think that's something that we need to do. Okay. Yeah. Tapping Julia on the shoulder. How can you add in?

Facilitator: Yes, thanks Mark. Hi, Julia.

Lane: Yes. Thanks, Mark. I love that you talked about improv because I am an improviser – like *theatre* improv experience, not music improv. So, I was having that part of my brain tickled when you were talking about improvisation. And I just, I want to "yes and" something that you said – to bring in the improv. So, you said that we want... that the improvisational space is one where we can... we need to know that we have our voice respected and welcome. And that we're not just, you know, walking in lockstep, but we know enough about the song that we can kind of bring something in or the song or the scene or whatever, whatever, improvising. And what I added in my notes is "respected and welcome and protected," I think is something that I... especially if I think the question being about what programs and administrators can do. And I've been thinking about this in the context that we are in, where, having been in staff roles and now being in this, like, no role situation that we're in, we don't have academic freedom, we don't have intellectual property rights to our work – like you were talking about your course materials, Mark. We've never been in that position of being told that we have any kind of intellectual property rights over the things that we create. And that situation in this larger ecosystem feels very dangerous right now. It feels like the things that we're trying to do and say in our work – and you're talking about, you know, actively creating, trying to have your program come from a more anti racist stance – this is work that people... – I don't know about where you all are – but this is work that people are coming for right now at our institution, like quite actively.

So, I just on Friday – this is not part of my notes because it just happened – but on Friday afternoon I was teaching in a three-hour lecture – the lecture was a Health Sciences course on social determinants of health and the instructor is phenomenal – and one of the core learning objectives of the course is for students to learn about inclusive and anti-racist writing practices, and I created some inclusive and anti-racist writing guides in our institution – which are [*referring to W&P Teams repository*] shared with us in the collection of materials. And so, this instructor has always asked me to come in and do, for the last three years, to do a session on that for the students. So, I did. And I had this, just, in the lead up to it for the first time, had this sense that, like, maybe I'm not super protected when I do this work. And it definitely speaks to my high degree of privilege that it's the first time that that occurred to me. But it was occurring to me because of all… That is actually also interesting: in moving into the faculty association, we're on all kinds of different mail lists now that we didn't used to be on, and so we're seeing a lot more of the kinds of conversations that are happening at the university. And you can't unsee those things. And you then are like, wow, *this* is the water. I thought it was this, but it's actually, *this* is the water that I meant.

So, there's definitely a lot of faculty who are doing a lot of work to… progressive work and challenging, critical, anti racist work. And there's a lot of faculty who are not, and who are kind of actively working against that and working for institutional neutrality. And so being someone who does not… My work is not protected by academic freedom, so if I say things and my credentials and my expertise and my voice are not valued or protected in the institution, and someone decides that I shouldn't be saying those things, I don't know what will happen. But I think that that real sense that in order to… When I think about those words, "build community and safety and security," trust is a huge part of all of those, and recognizing that many, many people, especially people who are in precarious contingent positions, who are often also racialized people or people who have other forms of oppressed identities, have high degrees of very, very valid institutional mistrust. And so, we don't come in from a place of trusting that our voices are respected or welcomed. And then when we also sense that they're potentially not protected, I think that's a really hard place to start building community and safety and security from. And so, Jason, I know you said hopefully this is the more uplifting question, and I looked at my notes and I was like, oh sorry. But I mean, I really love all of the really positive things that Mark shared or that we can be doing on a really human personal level to connect with each other to share from a place of privilege, to share any institutional privilege we have and, sort of, think about what resources we have access to and how are we actively reallocating those resources instead of hoarding. So, I love all of those things that you said, Mark, and I "yes and" them.

And I also think for me when I saw this question, what administrator… I mean, I am not an administrator. Our administrator, the head of our centre, is going on a six-month leave, and so we've been trying to figure out who's going to step up to it, and I was like, oh gosh, I hope it's not me. But… So, you know, this is me feeling into unknown space to think about this. But from my perspective, administrators can and need to think really strategically and big picture about this work and the place of this work within the institution, and honestly name what that is to the people that they work with, and then be really ready to advocate in the wider institutional ecosystem. So, being ready and excited, I guess, to speak about our skills and qualifications and the essential role that we play in the work of the institution. And I, what I wrote here is, I think this advocacy needs to be not only really bold, but it also needs to be persistent perhaps to the point of being like dogged. It needs to just be constant. And then… Because I think in the absence of seeing that kind of, like, “I will step up for you, I have your back” [attitude], what I have experienced is a kind of “talking the talk but not walking the walk” [attitude] around community and safety and security. And that feels like gaslighting to me. That is what I have felt, and I see some nodding [*referring to the video feed],* is that it feels like people are being like, and this is the quote I wrote, “I know your position is only a three-month contract, and I'm not going to do anything about that, but trust me, I want you to feel safe and secure as part of this community. And here we have a potluck lunch. Hooray, we're a community.” And that's what it feels like a lot of the time for me. So, I’m just naming that I don't think this is a strategy that works. So, yes. I think that the really strategic resource sharing that Mark was talking about is a huge part of it and really big picture. Persistent advocacy so that we feel and see that our administrators appreciate us and have our backs.

And then… Because beyond that, I actually don't know if community and safety and security are realistic or the goals that we should be approaching, like trying to approach, in the context of precarious labor. For my own self, when I have been in those roles, I've actually found it much more helpful to have administrators just acknowledge my precarity and insecurity and then help me, like Mark was saying, help me think strategically about how I might get out of, like, how this might be a next step – which is also really, like… It's like the snake eating its own tail a little bit, I think because it feels like – I saw Sarah [*referring to the Zoom chat*] saying what we need is a stable workforce, and so we're doing all these… we're all putting in all this work to, like, help all these people leave us. And so, we're back in that loss. When we have this structure and very often the best we can do is help people leverage a precarious role so that they can leave and go somewhere else, and then we lose our colleagues and our friends, and we lose their knowledge and expertise, and we’re back into… that’s where we're putting our labor is helping the next person leverage the role and leave us. So, I don't think that's a great long-term solution. I think it's

where we are. But on a personal level, having that recognition – like this is a precarious contingent role, it is not secure, and I want to help you be strategic about that – feels more genuine and empowering than just being, like, you are a valued part of our community, which I am clearly not. So, yeah. That's my not very uplifting answer, but it comes on the tail of all the uplifting, great things that Mark said. So, we'll just… Let's focus on those.

Facilitator: Thanks, Julia. And you know, maybe we could get to some more uplifting stuff here in a second. But… Or we could just be real about the situation we're in. Thanks so much both of you. And yeah, I agree, Mark: we go through this cycle of justifying our classes, our roles, why we teach, the way we teach, why writing classes need to be small. This work has been done. There's decades of research out there. And yet, constantly we're faced with this, because, you know… At our institution, it's 32 [seats] for first-year writing. And "does it need to be that small like?" That's a question we're posed with. And we have to try to… ah. So, with our next question, we're kind of… We're running low on time, but Sarah, can you correct me? Is there a time we need to stop the interview by?

Dr. Sara Humphreys (Principal Investigator): Yeah, we should stop at 11:30 because our wonderful, absolutely amazing, ASL folks and captionists have to go. But so, you know, yeah. But I want to say… Yeah. Okay. I'll be quiet. Here I go.

Facilitator: Yeah, 11:30 that… No, that's fine. That's perfect.

So, what I was thinking, with the next two questions – and if we get to the questions after that, great, if not, maybe we can bring some of that into the discussions that we'll have after the interviews – I was wondering… So, what are some steps that administrators can take – and maybe if you have anything to say about unions, you could work that in there as well – but to help support underfunded and undervalued writing programs, which, I would, you know, dare to say that that describes every writing program in North America. But maybe there's a few exceptions where the institution really values their writing programs and writing instructors, but I've yet to see it. So, yeah: what are some things that administrators might do to try and help secure resources or help make these larger issues… hopefully address these larger issues?

Blaauw-Hara: I would love to know because I think, exactly as you said, Jason, I… Yeah, I don't know. I have yet to meet a writing program where people are like "we have, you know, money falling out our ears." Yeah. So, Sarah mentioned this, right? I think that we have… A few of those last questions are intertwined. Like, with the professionalization of writing studies, you know, the academic identity of writing studies, and then, like, the resources as well, I think probably are connected. And I have some thoughts.

I think that… Alright. So I'll share a few ideas. So, I think one thing that that we can do – unfortunately, I don't have a slam dunk out of any of these – but one thing that we can do though is learn to speak the language of the university because we… I mean exactly, as Jason said, there's so much scholarship to do with, for example, class sizes or to do with, you know, contingent labour and how it's better to have, you know, continuing faculty that that, you know… So, there's so much research that's there. But I have found that to be… The higher up administrations you know, vice presidents, provosts, deans, stuff like that, it's not that they reject that scholarship. It's just in my experience they, you know, they nod along with it and then they counter with things like finances and stuff like that. So, it's hard.

What I have found to be somewhat helpful – and I also had the good fortune and the honor of co-facilitating what's called the WPA Workshop for new and continuing WPAs as part of the Council of Writing Program Administrators, and I did want to put out a plug for that. It happens every year, and it's a multi-day workshop where you get to learn from several experienced facilitators about a lot of different things such as assessment, setting writing program goals, to hiring and mentoring faculty members, and all kinds of stuff. But, this is something that I learned from that workshop, from my colleagues at that workshop, was trying to figure out what's the strategic plan for the university? What are the goals that the university has that those upper administrators are being held accountable for? And then how can you tie that to the work that you're doing? And it does feel… Yeah, [*referring to the Zoom chat*] Sarah, I have to tell you, I just want you to contribute to everything, including like, if you can, my mental dialogue as well because I love everything that you're writing in our chat. So, please continue.

But anyway. So, I mentioned earlier that we're doing this big two-year assessment of the writing program. Before we even started that, we went back and we looked at what, like… So, our first-year writing program was started by a cross-disciplinary group of faculty and administration at UT-M, and they came up with, after they had a number of different meetings, they came up with a big written rationale – many pages – for why they thought that a first-year writing course was needed, what they hoped it would do, here are the things that they hoped it would achieve. And they had those bulleted out, okay? So, that seemed like a logical first step when we had new administration come in who didn't seem to have any awareness of any of that history and was kind of questioning the whole program. You know, it was like, well, let's see if we're following through on the things that this program was created to do. Let's think about how we can assess whether we are, you know, establishing a cohort of first-year students, that we're easing that university transition, how might we be able to assess that? Are the students writing any better than they did before the course? Let's see how we can assess that. And then we also found a document where the university – or, our campus of the university – had some external

consultants who came in and dinged us on a number of things. Like one thing was EDI issues, another was student retention, you know, that our retention rates had not budged in years and years.

Well, those things tend to be connected to first-year writing. You know, first-year writing is connected to student retention and persistence, and there's some good scholarship that has been done at other institutions to demonstrate that. Let's see if we can see those types of patterns here at our institution. Let's try to come up with focus groups where we evaluate whether students from diverse backgrounds are feeling more comfortable with the university and are being introduced to university resources such as our Academic Skills Centre in our writing course. That will lead to them, you know, doing better in their other classes beyond our writing classes.

We also found through, you know, having students do basically a pre-test post-test type method, which has lots of limitations, but it's a good, like, blunt instrument, we found that students who wrote… we found that our first-year writing course narrows the gap between students who come in writing well and students who come in writing less well. And that is including students who are international students. It seems to produce measurable, pretty big measurable, improvements in their writing competencies. It helps students who come from surrounding areas feel more connected to the university.

And so these are things that we can then make that jump from saying these are good outcomes, that we can all agree are good outcomes, and it connects to these areas that the university got dinged on when they had some external evaluators come in. So, like, hey, Dean, hey, you know, Provost, you can point to our writing program as interventions that the university is doing to try to address some of those concerns that the university has at large. So, have these translated into huge amounts of money? I don't know. I mean, the Dean has said that we… He has said what do you need in terms of resources to do this assessment? So that's worked okay, that we haven't had to pay for our assessment programs and hiring people and paying students and stuff like that. We haven't had to pay for that out of our own finances. That's good. It hasn't translated into more, you know, continuing term faculty. I hope it does. Maybe it will. You know, we're going to definitely make that argument.

But yeah, learn to speak the language that people speak outside of your writing program and learn to come up with some numbers. I am less comfortable with numbers. I love qualitative interviewing and focus groups and stuff like that. But we had to speak quantitative data too, and so we found some faculty members outside of our department: educational developers. I know, Julia [*referring to the Zoom chat*]. I'm so sorry. I'm good at arithmetic, but when people talk about, like… I don't even know the terms. "Is this

statistically significant?” Gosh, I don't know. Somebody told me it was, you know? So, find people who speak numbers, who are maybe outside of your department, who you can partner with on things too.

I do think that… I'm going to jump very briefly because, Julia, I think you're going to be better at speaking at the union thing than I am because I think you touched on that. I mean, we do have some of our contingent faculty members, you know, are in different situations with the Union, and we basically just try to follow the Union guidelines. There's lots and lots of sections for people to be scheduled in, and so it seems to work okay as far as that goes, but I don't have big secrets for that.

But I think that the characterization of Writing Studies as a service discipline is a problem. It leads to the staffing challenges that we've been talking about. You don't see Math or Biology or whatever doing this, you know. There's this idea that anybody can teach writing, and it's just not true. So, I agree – and I'm not saying anything negative about anybody else's program. I think that in Canada, as well as in the United States, we have a problem where we need to professionalize Writing Studies, and show that this is something that has a disciplinary core. There is decades and decades of, if not millennia, if you go back to like Aristotle and stuff, scholarship that has to do with how people learn writing and why it's important. And it makes us… The precarious working conditions are an outgrowth of that, but they also they work in a feedback loop to make it harder for us to develop an academic identity because if you are worried about where your next job is going to be, you – and you’re piecing together employment from a lot of different institutions – you don't have a lot of time to write, let's say. You don't have institutional funding to do a long-term research project. You're not going to be publishing. And so, what we need in Canada is home-grown scholarship, whether that's in terms of presentations or publications. And there are awesome organizations, one of which I'm a part of, CWCA, that is doing excellent work, as is CASDW, doing outstanding work. We need more of that. But it's hard. So, with an eye on the time: Julia, please feel free to talk for the entire end of our session.

Lane: Thank you, Mark. Sarah, Jason, Natalie, is it… I do have things to say about unions, but I'm wondering, Mark just talked about academic identity, so can I jump to the end?

Facilitator: Absolutely, yeah, yeah.

Lane: Okay. So I will… Later I can say some things about unions, but I just want to jump to the last two questions and try to talk about them a bit together, dovetailing off of what Mark was saying.

So, the last two questions are about writing centre staff lacking academic freedom. How might that lack be an issue and how can associations and unions and other support

mechanisms assist writing staff in this? And then the last question is, does writing studies in what is now called Canada suffer from a lack of academic identity, exacerbated by precarious working conditions and de-professionalization? So, I wanna talk about those two things together. I want to say that I think… I already mentioned the experiences of lack of academic freedom, and I guess to tie it to the other question about being underfunded and undervalued, I just want to say that I think it's important to name that the underfunded is a symptom of the undervalued. And so… Mark was talking about the sort of, like, cyclical things that happen. And so, recognizing that I think we need to work at the undervalued piece. Often I think we work at the underfunded [piece]. We try to get funding for specific programs or initiatives, but it doesn't do anything to that larger context of how we are understood in the larger environment and institution. And Mark was just talking about those huge bodies of research. And so, I think figuring out how and who takes responsibility for continuing to have these conversations and putting the information consistently out there. Because I think what can often happen is that administrators are people who have moved out of precarious roles and into supported roles and often see those roles as being not rocking the boat. Like, they're… Administrators are very much rewarded for a "go along to get along" kind of approach to things and so we need to get out of that.

And I've been really interested and inspired recently by the idea of refusal. And so, I'm just sharing Sandy Grande's article "Refusing the University." Like, where do we need to be resistant and not just meeting the expectations and the always increasing expectations that we do more with less all the time? Where and when do we say "no. We actually will not or cannot do that" in the way that we've been structured, it's not possible? And then on the on the point of academic freedom: so, while the underfunded is a symptom of the undervalued, I also want to say that the denial of access to academic freedom is a way of ensuring that our expertise is always diminished and we can't make the kinds of contributions that are possible when writing centres are staffed by faculty members who do have academic freedom. So, it's another self-perpetuating cycle. And the university has actually said this to us: "If you want us to treat you like faculty, you have to act like faculty. You have to research and publish and attend conferences." But we can't do that because the expectations of us on the day-to-day are to do things that are very administratively driven: to gather the kinds of data that Mark's talking about, where we already have that data, but we just have to do it again to prove that small class sizes are important in our context in this time period.

So, all of this inequity requires us to do collective organizing and advocacy and, I think, to work on a collective level because we will always be as vulnerable as our most vulnerable members. And in my notes here, I have a swear word, and I want to see what the ASL of it

is. So, we will always be as vulnerable as our most vulnerable members and some of our members are really ******* vulnerable – Yeah! [*Referring to the video*] Oh, it's this? Okay! – structurally, and that vulnerability is held over them and it's used to threaten them and diminish them all the time. So, I want to just say that.

And I also want to say that for a long time I was not really aware of that. I had a lot of privilege, I said this in the class the other day, like I've always been a white woman. I've always walked through the world in that way. And I just sort of went along doing my work and not really thinking about the structure of my role. But I have been thinking about that a lot more in the last while. And so, just to jump down here to this question of do we lack an academic identity: I think my answer's kind of yes, but it's more complicated than a lack, and I am... The first thing that came to me when I started trying to answer this question was W.E.B. Du Bois' idea of double consciousness. And so, he wrote about this in *The Souls of Black Folks* in 1903. And then I was really... I wrote all this answer, and then I recently reread Neisha-Anne Green's article "The Re-Education of Neisha-Anne Green," and she talks about double consciousness as well in linguistic justice work. And she talks about having a triple consciousness, and I was. Whoa, wow. Okay. So, I feel like I should talk about this. Although I do it somewhat cautiously, I don't want to appropriate this idea of double consciousness, but I do want to share what Du Bois said, so he wrote: "It's a peculiar sensation, this double consciousness. This sense of always looking at oneself through the eyes of others. Of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels twoness: two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings, two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder."

And so, I want to recognize unequivocally that what I'm talking about here and what we experience in writing studies and writing centres is not the same thing as what Du Bois writing about. And as a white woman I know I can't understand the depth of that, what he's articulating, in large part because my writing centre identity is one that I don't carry with me everywhere and doesn't mark me in every space that I enter. But despite the danger of possibly appropriating, I want to reference Du Bois' work because he's smarter than me. And he's articulated something that I think really gets at the core of what I have experienced and what I think I see other people experiencing as writing centre professionals and writing studies professionals, which is that we have a well developed academic identity as people: we are engaged with our work, we are engaged with each other, we are engaged in our community as scholars. We research, we research the literature, we do empirical and data-driven studies in our own centres, we write, we publish, we present a conferences, we offer each other formal and informal types of peer review. We have a well developed academic identity, but we don't see that academic

identity reflected back to us in a wider system. And what we actually see reflected back to us is, I think, what Du Bois calls that amused contempt – the sort of patronising look in the eye that when someone says to us, oh, it's really cute that you did that research. It's so cute that you want to play scholarly dress-up, but you'll never be like us, like the real academics. We can only ever be "quasi-faculty," which is what we're being called. So, that experience that I've been having of going through joining the Faculty Association but having everything we do be undermined has really laid bare for me an undercurrent that has always been there, I think, of disrespect and minimizing of our work – and it's being dragged out in the open through these bargaining conversations.

And I know we're at overtime, but as for solutions, you know, damned if I know Du Bois wrote the "dogged strength alone" holds things together. And I see that dogged strength in my colleagues. I see it in all of you who've come here and especially in the folks who have put this project together. And I also do want to say we are tired, and our colleagues of colour are absolutely exhausted, and there's no reason that they shouldn't be because the pressure on them to hold so many kinds of double consciousnesses together is exhausting.

So, I have a list of things that if it came up to me, that are definitely inadequate, but in order they are: **One**, we show up for our colleagues who are burning out. We listen to them, we validate them. We let them know that what they're experiencing is real and isn't their fault. We hold space for them. [**Two,**] We then do our best to hold the institutions around us to account for what they're doing to us and our colleagues. **Three,** we recognize our own limits. We really have to get out of the "doing more with less hustle." I don't think anyone's going to do that for us. They will continue to expect us to do as much as we've done and then more. So, the real challenge is that we have to show up for each other and also maintain our academic identities – and none of that work is core to our job, so we're also then doing our jobs. So we keep getting pulled back into these cycles where we squeeze more and more in because what's important to us isn't always important to our bosses. So, **four,** my own attempted solution is to find strategic ways to say strategic "Nos" and to refuse and to resist. And I also want to name that as a woman I haven't been socialized to do that, so it's hard. This often means finding ways to refocus, retool, and reallocate work so that it's more aligned with my own experience of what I feel is an academic identity. So, spending less time micromanaging time sheets and more time collaborating for example. **Five:** Advocate, advocate, advocate, never stop talking about writing: its role in the university and our role in shaping students experience of it. **Six:** Rest. Really leave work sometimes – not just with your body, but also with your mind and your heart. Don't put teams on your phone. And then **seven**: Repeat. So that's my list. And thank you – especially to the interpreters for going overtime.

Facilitator: Thank you so much to both you, Julia, and Mark. Yes. I think that list was amazing. Also, I would say don't put Outlook on your phone. I took it off, and it made a huge difference.

Appendix D: Writing, Technology, and Accessibility

Panel Interview with Dr. Jay Dolmage, Professor and Chair, English (Waterloo); Dr. Laila Ferreira, Assistant Teaching Professor, School of Journalism, Writing, and Media (UBC)

Facilitated by Dr. Jason Collins (UVic)

Editorial Note: The audio recording toward the end of this interview was compromised. The affected section has been italicized to indicate possible errors in transcription.

October 23rd, 2024

Interview Questions

- There is a great deal of fear around GenAI at the moment. What kinds of support do you think writing instructors, support staff, and administrators need to provide students a safe and inclusive learning environment?
- How does technology create barriers in academic environments? Let's reverse the question, how can technology provide greater access?
- What does accessibility mean to you in writing classrooms and writing centres?
- How does technology or lack thereof further systemic oppression in writing classrooms?
- After reviewing participant materials on SharePoint, what summative comments do you have to share?

Transcript

Facilitator (Dr. Jason Collins): Welcome Jay and Laila. We'll get started with our first question. So. Yeah, there's a great deal of fear around generative AI at the moment. So, in thinking about AI, maybe technology in general, what kinds support do you think writing instructors, support staff, and administrators could provide to students to create a safe and inclusive learning environment when it comes to technology? If you have thoughts on AI, we'd love to hear those. So, either one of the speakers can… whoever feels like this is… you're itching to answer them.

Dr. Laila Ferreira: Well, I feel like this is a really cold start. Like boom.

Facilitator: I know. Yeah, it is. We're jumping right in there.

Ferreira: I don't know if everybody… I see some familiar people on the list, but not everyone would know who I am. But I just wanted to say thank you. I'm very honored to be asked here today. I wanted to thank Sarah and the whole entire team. I'm unfortunately… was unable to attend other workshops because of, you know, life events. But I'm really honoured to be here and just thank you for having me. So I'm an assistant professor of teaching at UBC in WRDS: writing, research, and discourse studies within the School of Journalism, Writing and Media. We're like the Little Writing Studies program that could. And we're… [we] just launched a minor in writing and communications. So we're, you know, now we have this school. My pedagogical and research interests are in inclusive and accessible writing curriculum instruction in classrooms. I am currently working in a large teaching and learning enhancement-funded program… um, project on AI in writing. So we're developing resources, piloting them in our classrooms. So I do have a lot to say about what we've learned so far in this area, particularly with AI. So I'll just… I can get started and then we can riff off one another.

I would say we need a lot more resources. It's a very fluid and rapidly changing situation. I'm concerned. And that's part of the project that we're working on, is one of the key concerns. A lot of the people working on this AI and writing project were involved in another TLEF project that I was also a part of on academic integrity, and it really did transform how academic integrity was taught and managed and discussed and dealt with at UBC. And so what we saw happening with GenAI and writing and our students was that deficit mindset was returning and becoming, like, that approach was students [are] cheating, and everybody was going to start cheating, and they were all going to start using AI to write. So this real focus on this, the students as a sort of deficit mindset and model. The issue is that it is scary. It does take a lot of resources. We need to talk through that fear. I think it's providing more opportunities for people to work through all the fears that they're having around AI, and to be given more resources in order to adapt their own teaching of writing in order to learn with the students around what it means for our teaching of writing and what it means for them and ourselves as writers.

So I would say instead of… I would like to see us providing more resources towards our faculty and staff in order to support students better in… they have a lot of questions. I think we assume the students know how to use it, and they don't. And I think we need a lot more attention on how we are going to be speaking to students about it and the ways in which we're going to be teaching students how to use it, as well as learning how to manage that ourselves. So a lot more resources, a lot more attention, a lot more space. Not just,

“Here's a policy on privacy. Everybody can do what they want in their classrooms.” That’s just not going to work. I'll let Jay jump in.

Facilitator: Thank you.

Dr. Jay Dolmage: Thanks so much, Laila. So yeah, my name's Jay Dolmage, and I'm here at the University of Waterloo. You can see my messy office here today. I'm a middle-aged white man. I'm wearing dark glasses. Thinning hair. All of these things are factors in my fall so far this year. It's been a busy one. I'm a chair of my department as well, but my background is in writing studies, and here at Waterloo, we've, sort of taken up... When I first started here, we had an exam for writing. So it was a really outdated model, and it really set up and structured writing as something that was very exterior to the university and the curriculum. It was kind of a way of streaming certain students away from the university. And what we've created is a universal writing requirement. And so what we have is each faculty, each unit in the university, has different ways of satisfying that requirement. But here in English we teach writing courses for our own majors, we teach them for students in math and computer science, we teach them for engineers, we teach them for science, the Faculty of Science as well. Very large writing program probably about 4,500 to 5,000 students a year come through our program, or our different courses.

So, that situates us in an interesting and complicated place. Because we are... We have these courses that we've been teaching for 20-25 years and these approaches. We have the research expertise that we have in our unit, especially around things like digital media, around accessibility – my own background is in disability studies, obviously. But we also are working with stakeholders across the university who can sometimes have very different attitudes than we do. And we're also working with support units across campus and academic and pedagogical units across campus who can have different mandates too, so. All of that goes to say that that here at Waterloo, I think it's a confusing... there has been a confusing approach, and I think I'm echoing Dr. Ferreira when I say that there are many different messages that students get about AI for example and intellectual honesty and integrity, intellectual property, all of these things. So. We also then work with the Faculty Association we work with a not too high but a reasonable number of sessional faculty who don't have the same protections that that tenure stream and teaching stream faculty have here.

This is not really answer, this is all just kind of context. But I I'm saying it out loud because I think it speaks to some of the complexity of other folks probably who are here. And so the answers that I might have, the approaches that I might have in my own individual classroom – and I only teach these introductory writing classes. I love teaching them. But I feel a level of confidence with how I want to approach these things in that context, and I

feel... sometimes powerless, sometimes pulled in many different directions, sometimes just as confused as other people when I have to navigate this from a kind of programmatic level or look at what the picture is campus wide. I would say Waterloo has a lot of resources and information, but not much guidance. And we currently, coming out of the pandemic, don't have much of a campus community. So that when there are, kind of, opportunities to take part in discussion, to involve students and get their input and feedback, they're not very well attended, and so the information doesn't get shared very well. That's probably enough from me for now. I'm thinking we're probably just beginning to dig into this.

Facilitator: Yeah. Thank you so much. You know, before we get into the next question, I just wanted to open up space, Laila, for you to talk a little bit about the AI project. If you're interested. I thought maybe that might help give us an example of one of the things that's happening in writing studies around this topic.

Ferreira: Okay. Sure. Well, the people involved in the project are, you know, people who work primarily, you know, teaching, writing, same. I'm the same. I teach primarily first-Year writing courses here at UBC, and we teach one of the key, main courses that are required by students across the faculties of Arts and Sciences for their writing requirement. But we have different diverse people working on this project, and it really is about creating resources. And we're willing to get stuck in and do the work to try out these different learning strategies, approaches, ways of redesigning our courses in order to take into account the changes that AI are creating in terms of how our students are engaging in our courses and with writing.

It... What I think we've been finding is that it is very complicated. Like Doctor Dolmage was saying, it can change, and also you might have something that works in your classroom that doesn't work for someone else. So, creating resources that are going to be taken up more broadly is challenging.

I think the time it takes to develop, to read, to redesign some of our activities and to develop teaching materials in AI takes a lot of time. So there's... If you're looking at resources that are needed, it's time. And you're already teaching students. You have 13 weeks typically, and also only a certain amount of time that you have as well to design your course. Particularly if we're talking about people who are contingent. So it's very challenging.

And also that the AI is changing. So you might spend all that time designing something and then two days later when you go to do it in your classroom, it's changed. So I've had that exact experience. Within two days, it's all different. So how do we... How are we going to be

supported in doing that work? So part of that is developing these resources, strategies, and also coordinating with other units on campus – so computer science is lso engaged in a project to do with GenAI and writing code and what they're doing there. So coming together with other units across campus and really sharing more information because it can get siloed as we know, yeah. So that's really... So it's really a very cross-disciplinary cross-campus approach.

Facilitator: Thank you. Yeah, yeah. I agree. I think it's great the way you put that. When we're thinking about AI and whether or not we're working with it in the classroom or providing resources, to keep in mind that this is a fluid thing. It's very much in flux. Yeah.

Okay. So our next question is about technology and barriers. We're curious: does technology create barriers in academic environments? But also, like, how can technology provide greatera access? So, you know, what kinds of barriers might be thrown up in the implementation of certain technologies, but also like how can technologies make writing classrooms or writing centres more inclusive or more accessible?

Dolmage: Maybe I'll take this one first and we can take turns that way. I mean, there's sort of a variety of ways. I think maybe we should say... There were, you know... For disabled students before the pandemic, there were certain types of adjustments and ways that they were asking to be included and for their bodies and minds to be understood in higher education. They wanted more flexibility around attendance and participation, for example, and were told that that was impossible. And then all of a sudden, we had a pandemic and students were told that wasn't allowed, that in person attendance and participation was allowed, and we had to find other ways to do it, right? And so we... A lot of the kind of accommodations... If students had created a a map or a repertoire, and there are a couple of studies that showed this and I'd glad to share that research with folks, but, the kinds of things they were asking for were things that we get out of what we would have called asynchronous learning, right? Which obviously predated the pandemic and will continue after and during. But it's... More students had a sense that learning could happen in something more than 50-minute races within 12-week races. That there were really interesting and powerful ways for them to engage with courses materials outside of the class, ways for them to engage with one another and reflect and ways for them to engage with their writing, right, and one another's writing.

For me, and for a lot of other instructors, I think that allowed us to really enrich what we see and think of the classroom as, right? There are lots of people who were doing that before, you know. But I think in a much more widespread way, people came to understand that you're going to get more involvement, there's more ways for more people to be involved, there are ways for folks to engage with creating access and accessibility for one

another through, you know, technological tools, whether those are, you know, things like shared notes, whether those are simply, you know, transcribing and sharing transcripts from class, right? Captioning video, right? Creating text interpretations of data, right? Like there's a wide variety of ways to engage with this. And we had to do those things when we moved on.

Like, it's an interesting point, and maybe I'll just like, hold on this point for a second. But like, when things happen asynchronously and online, all of a sudden they are governed in new ways by things like the AODA in Ontario, for example, right? By accessibility law, right? You cannot just throw a video up. That's interesting because you can just throw a lecture up. And people do it all the time, and they don't necessarily think about whether or how they could make it more accessible. So maybe that's like a point I'll just hold on because I think it's an important and powerful one. There's a little bit of an irony there that that maybe through some of the teaching we do that's mediated by technology, we are actually forced to think about accessibility more than we do in the classroom. And that's an irony that's worth holding. I also do think that there's an irony there in that things that disabled students have been asking for a very long time became kind of a matter of course. And that should highlight the fact that we can change and make teaching more accessible, but also that that has never been… that we've never properly listened to disabled students. They've never been the drivers of that, even though they can and should be.

Facilitator: Thank you so much, Jay.

Farreira: Mhmm. Yeah absolutely. I agree with all of that. I would say one of the issues, then, still, is that some of those possibilities are being taken away at this point with an emphasis – reemphasis – on in person. And so, I see that with… happening with colleagues, disabled colleagues, and also with disabled students. The opportunities for them to learn online or to have access to accessible learning materials is, although it's been strengthened in many ways to the pandemic, it's starting to be taken away or attention has been moving on from that. I think that's a real concern that we need to really remind ourselves and our colleagues and administrators that this is really key and fundamental to our work in, in teaching, writing and across the university.

Yes, the technology has increased accessibility in many ways. As has already been laid out. But I would say that the… So sometimes the incorporation of technology adds cognitive load. It requires, if you're incorporating into your classrooms, it requires teaching students how to use it. It involves teaching problem solving and how to attend to complications that necessarily arise when we're learning… we're using learning technology. A lot of students are already stressed and anxious. That's what I've been finding in piloting different technologies in my classroom that I'm using to increase

accessibility. Students are already stressed and anxious and really struggle to process when things don't work out really well. So that takes a lot of time. And so sometimes, like right now, we're halfway through the term or almost more than halfway through the term, and some students are still struggling to, you know, figure out certain technologies. So I think we need to consider that as well: that we are teaching how to use them and we're not just applying them in our classrooms. And that requires time on our part as well to understand how to use them. How to apply them and implement them in ways that are going to be inclusive and accessible.

And then, of course, you know, as you find out, you know, as you find out, if you're teaching with technology, not all students have access to the resources needed to use that technology. And so sometimes, you know, some technologies we might actually, just stop using because not all students can access those resources or have the tools they need to access that technology. I think it's really important for us to keep that in mind: the technology can create complications and not always create the most accessible situation for all students.

Facilitator: Yeah. Thank you so much. To both of you. So, with our next question, we're interested in what does accessibility mean to you? Maybe what does it look like? How do you practice it? How do you think about accessibility, whether it's in the writing classroom, in writing centres.. But also we've had quite a few librarians with us over the workshop, so maybe in in the library. But yeah, we're interested in general. What is this? What does accessibility mean to you? What does it look like?

Dolmage: I can give it a go here. I mean, I'm trained as a rhetorician and accessibility is one of those terms that's had a lot of its meaning vacuumed out. I think there would be a wide range of ways to answer this question. To me, I think, like, accessibility on its own doesn't really mean very much because it can mean most of the time something very minimal. And I use examples of this all the time, but, you know, walk around your campus and notice how many of the accessibility, sort of, measures and even we might think of them as investments, don't match up. So how many times there's a push button door that leads to another door that doesn't have a push button. You know, that's the kind of thing that happens over and over again, right? So and it's... So, disability plus accessibility means something to me, right? But increasingly, that's meant something that is focused on disability rights rather than disability justice: it's focused on a legalistic model of disability, right? Where we need to... That is minimal. That has a ceiling. But also that has a series of costs.

So I think of accessibility as a commitment to the ongoing examination of what we do as teachers and learners. But it doesn't very often manifest as that. So it's not actually a term

that I use that much. So, you know, even just like, why do we say Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)? You know, access means a lot more. It's also one of those terms on university campuses that has been co-opted by accessibility services, and I have nothing against... we have to work with accessibility services. We need to do this, but that has again really kind of created a very pretty narrow corridor for what we think about as what we might call like inclusion, right? Or disability justice, or, you know, other terms that are also having their meaning vacuumed out, like belonging. Universities are incredibly efficient at checklistifying things like this and bringing us up to a kind of very minimal approach and sucking out a lot of the history of the terminology and a lot of the activism of the terminology and a lot of the action that we might take now. So I think in my own classroom, I see access as a collective responsibility. And that that we have a role in the classroom to understand the access that we need, but also to create access for others and that's to come to through whatever arrangement we have in the classroom, new understandings of what access means. I can be more tangible about that, but I don't wanna talk too much.

I think my quick answer is, you know it doesn't mean very much. It doesn't have much purchase. To most people, it means one line on your syllabus that refers people actually out of your classroom. And I'll go a step further that referring the student out of your classroom, it reassures folks that they don't have to change anything in fact. It reassures the university that it can continue doing things the ways that it always has done things, and that there will be small, minimal accommodations made for the very few students who even seek those accommodations – and the data on the number of students who actually even seek accessibility the way that we've circumscribed it is really alarming. Like 75% of the students at Waterloo, 75% of disabled students at Waterloo, will never disclose their disability to the university in any way, shape or form, and that holds true pretty much across Canadian universities. I don't wanna rant too much, but at the same time we have this giant industry of accommodation and accessibility. But it's focused on only one thing, and that's extended time on tests and exams.

And that situates us in a tricky spot in the writing classroom too. University of Victoria last year, 18,000 extended time on tests and exams accommodations. 18,000, right? University of Waterloo we're getting ready, in about a month and a half, to have somewhere in the neighborhood of 1300 timed exams happen within 11 days, including exams that go up till Saturday night at 10:00 PM. Right? Giant industry, and it's overwritten disability. If you go and look up disability on Google Scholar, disability plus higher education, it's all articles that are saying our timed test and exam accommodations fair? And there's no good research about anything else, and especially not about the things that we might do in a writing classroom where we don't give, generally, we don't give time tests or exams. The

problem there though, is like we imagine that something's being done. And it's... It doesn't apply to our classroom, so we can kind of pat one another on the back and be like, oh, doesn't apply to us, right? Well, then you have to say “what does apply to us?” What would accessibility actually mean for us when we're not part of the, like, massive – and when I say massive, I mean like overwhelmingly massive – discourse around accessibility on our campuses? We can sort of say, like, let that happen over there. We're somehow better teachers than them. But then, what are what are *we* actually doing?

Facilitator: Yeah. Thanks for that, Jay.

Ferreira: Yes, I'm 100% on all of that. I would say, yeah, if we... if you're forcing me to say what it means, it means, for me... accessibility is, yes, attending to, you know, the structural material aspects of the learning situation in my classroom, but also it's about teaching in a way, for me, fundamentally from the ground up as the classroom being a social learning space, and that we're all responsible for supporting one another's learning, and that we all are impacting one another's learning by what we bring to that classroom as well. And so, really, it's about attending to all of the differences that I bring, that the students bring to the learning situation in terms of background, lived experience, identity, disability, cultural background, race, etc. and to then, how this classroom space can bring people together in learning. And because my course topic, my writing topic is on disability, we... I explicitly talk about how I've designed the course. So making all those things visible to the course, to the students, and opening the space up for them to also talk about what's accessible or inclusive for them and isn't in the classroom space. And so, not relying on disability or medical accommodations because of all of those, the research that's been done on students not accessing those resources and accommodations – and to be honest, yeah, we don't give tests, so it's a totally different kind of accommodation space that's required. So, applying principles and approaches that do not require students to have to get accommodations, which, you know, creates... It's putting the onus on the instructors. Because the accessibility centres with as much as they try to do, it's not... it’s not meeting actually the teaching situations that we're in. So for me it really is about that environment, the learning environment that I'm creating, and the openness around how the course is being taught, and also all of the barriers that students and I experience in creating accessible learning situations for them.

And also addressing... For me, it means addressing absences in the classroom. And those who have been marginalized or excluded from writing classrooms. So. Particularly this term, I'm more intentionally, even more, integrating assignments on writing and power and ethics in order to address all of these barriers the students themselves probably experienced in entering the writing classroom and the anxieties they have about writing

and the ways it's being used to assess them and the ways it's being used to monitor their participation at the university and their belonging at the university. So, attending to all of that in my classes as well and opening that space up for them. But that's all I can do in my classroom, right? And advocating as much as possible in terms of making accessibility something that actually meets the needs of students. Well, you can do your best with that, but there's all kinds of administrative and structural issues there.

Facilitator: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you. I agree with everything both of you have said. I tend to approach accessibility more broadly. So, access or barriers to access can look like many different things, right? It's not… I think you're right, Jay, it gets… The focus tends to be on like timed tests or making sure you have captions for videos, and if you do that, you're accessible. When in reality, barriers… there are many other kinds of barriers that you may need to address. And I just had a follow up, because I… You mentioned Laila, like, we have to maybe do this kind of work thinking about what are the barriers and how can we address those barriers for our students. I'm curious if either of you have thoughts on the kinds of support that we can provide to instructors to make access a part of… a stronger part of the course, the focus of the course, anything that you've done or are in the process of doing to provide that kind of support?

Dolmage: I think it's so… It's super big picture. So like, I think there's so much we can do. Maybe the most, maybe the most useful thing I can say is that we actually have to be willing to rethink everything. Like we have to be willing to rethink what we think writing is. The two biggest things for me, and they're maybe not that big, but they are things that we just don't think about very much. The first is that I've completely rethought what attendance and participation mean. And that's following from people like Melanie Yurgo and Margaret Price and others. But it took me a really long time to let go of what I thought attendance and participation meant and their value. And some of it is ego stuff, right? Because we do have smaller classes. Our classes in general, I think I'm not overly generalizing when I say this, but at Canadian institutions, our writing classes are smaller – maybe they should be smaller still, but they're some of the smallest classes the student will take. We're very likely… We'll know all of our students' names. They'll all know one another's names and that will be unique for them, especially in their first year of university. And again, we do some patting on the back with that, even though that does make the job of connection much clearer for us. And some of the things we can do in terms of individualizing our instruction a lot easier.

But the other biggest piece for me is like actually assessing way less. I really fear that we… Again, like when you really look at the research, there's way too much research on assessment. And that's not what I want to be. It's noot what I want to. I actually like to loop

all the way back to some concerns people might have with AI. We would have way, way less concern with AI if we hadn't constructed our identity way, way too much around assessment. Because assessment comes along with a bunch of other things that I didn't sign on for, nor do I have as values. Right? Around like fairness and you know those sorts of... I'm not saying I don't want to be fair. I'm just not obsessed with that. Like, and I don't actually even want to think about it too much in the classroom. An assessment forces me to be thinking about that all the time.

So like just as an example, you know we have these ideas that students have to do a certain amount of writing. And I think they're really misguided. I think students should have less assignments – that we assess much less than we do, right? And that would actually give them time to engage in things like revision in substantive ways – and they don't have that time because they're... in a 12-week term they're submitting sometimes 3 or 4 essays.

So I think like two big pieces for me are around assigning less work that needs to be assessed. And I'm not... Let's not joke about that. Like assigning one less major essay that frees up like 45 hours of my life, right? And that allows me to engage with the other things that I wanna do. We have an academic culture where we're asked to do more and more and more. And I think one of the best things we can do, if we're going to add some more things, like hearing more about accessibility or teaching students more about technology, like Dr. Ferreira was saying, we can only really do that if we take some things out. And I think there are big things we can take. It sounds trite, but my thinking is assess less so that I can connect with students more. And that for me has been taking out major assignments, taking out major assessments, and really rethinking what I mean by participation and attendance.

Facilitator: Thank you. That's wonderful

Ferreira: Yeah, I would build off of that to talk about, you know, what we mean by engagement as well. What is it to be engaged and to reassess that for ourselves? And I think it does come down to a bit of ego too and needing some kind of particular way of engaging that maybe we engaged in students or whatever we're expecting, is to really rethink that and offer other opportunities for students to engage, to show their engagement and material.

I know in our program we scaffold the assignments and so... One thing I would like to say, one, I think we need to be... across the university there needs to be more focus on teaching of writing in all units. Because we can do this work in our writing classroom, but then they go on to their third-year course in engineering and the engineering instructors are like, well, why don't they know how to paraphrase in engineering, right? And it's like, well, actually

there needs to be more of a mindset around we're all teaching students how to write within our field. So I think that is one key to making writing more accessible to students.

I can't remember what the original question was, but I'm just going on with what I was going to say. Yes. And then we scaffold assignments. So they do regular writing practice, but it's that each assignment is leading into the next assignment. So, for them, it makes sense that they're doing this assignment – this like say annotated bibliography – that is going to go towards this next iteration of the annotated bibliography with the proposal that then goes towards... right? So, it's all building on one another, so that allows more time and space for feedback, for peer review, for reflection on the writing. So it's even just... For us, like in terms of our curriculum, that's how we've designed it, so that creates a situation where students are able to be developing strategies on how to learn and how to write, and it feels meaningful because these are assignments that are building towards a final project. So that's one way in which we have sort of, just from our program, developed these strategies for students to make the writing more accessible.

And also they don't... The thing is that I think people assume students should know how to do certain things in terms of writing. And I don't think... I think that's... We should not be doing that, and that we should assume we need to teach students, how to engage in writing at university in meaningful ways, because they're not familiar with this different context that we're in. And so we need to be teaching them, and I think that needs to be integrated more fully across the university, to be honest, to make it fully accessible. And if we're talking about accessibility to students in all of their programs. And it should just be relying on the first-year writing course to do that.

Facilitator: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, I agree. I hear from students, often, that things aren't articulated in their upper-level courses when it comes to like what the expectations around writing are until they receive that grade and that feedback that oh, you didn't do this thing that you should have known that you were supposed to do in this very specific way. Yes, great. Good things to think about. Thank you.

Okay. So our last question, I think we've kind of talked about some of this already. So please feel free to speak to it, but also add you know any other thoughts you have around these topics of technology and access. But the question is does technology or a lack of technology further systemic oppression in writing classrooms? Yeah, I'll just leave it there and get your thoughts on that.

Dolmage: I mean no and yes. For sure. Both. There's another... Like I know I already isolated a couple of ironies, but there's another irony for me that gets all the way back to the AI thing – and this was already said by Doctor Ferreira – but a lot of... So there's a

particular kind of rhetorical pattern that we see happens, and it is an anti-student pattern. When there's a new technology, it gets used to construct students in a very ungenerous way. And I just see that overlapping with the ways that disabled students have always been constructed through a series of different discourses, right? The combinations process, which they've had no hand in shaping really, has at the same time overwritten disabled students all as potential cheaters. All as potentially faking it, right? And it's terrible. But I also see this happening with AI, right? And that's not to say I don't also understand a lot of the other under the water iceberg issues with AI. But just on the surface, I'm already seeing a mythology created that all students are cheating, right? And we know... We see individual faculty do this. We see the media do this, right, and in the ways that they talk about university students. But our colleagues, some of them, the general public is very quick to want to construct university students as getting something they don't deserve or manipulating a system. And AI... With technology that happens and around issues of disability that happens. And I'm just putting my thumb on that similarity. At least we can get together in knowing how to navigate or being frustrated at continually having to navigate that dynamic.

But on the other hand, I see, particularly, students, staff and faculty with disabilities, introducing new technological tools that I use in my teaching all the time, that absolutely do increase access, and they probably increase access for all students. You know, that's the electronic curb-cut effect. And it's real. You know, I can think of real, tangible examples of individual students who have helped do this and more generally, over time, practices that now are just very common to how we teach, that originally might have been kind of constructed as ways to increase access for disabled students. Yeah, that's my “no” and my “yes,” I guess? I... yeah. Those are just my initial thoughts about that, but I could probably go “no” a whole... I could probably “yes,” a whole lane. You know, a few different pathways through either one.

Facilitator: Thank you.

Ferreira: Yes, maybe I'll go into some of the weeds a little bit in terms of how technology itself is designed. So something like AI, we really need to be engaging with it. We just can't avoid it. But the AI is designed itself to perpetuate systemic oppression. So that's something you have to attend to for a long time, try to figure out as you're using it, as your teaching with it, as you're helping students to learn how to use it in ways that are ethical, and adhere to copyright and adhere to university privacy policies. And the technology itself, the design is... perpetuates systemic oppression. So I think you need... we need to think about the kinds of technology we're bringing into our classrooms, and we need... and to continuously talk about with our students as well who are going to grow up to be future

designers and working in these areas about how we need more diversity in terms of who is designing these technologies, who is advising on these technologies, who is... who are included in... from the ground up in terms of creating these technologies? And so my concern is the systemic oppressions that are perpetuated through the technology itself and the way it's designed. And I think many of us have probably come across ways in which when we're incorporating technology into our classrooms to ensure accessibility, we come up against design features and we can tell the person who's designing this either is not a teacher or is somebody who is not disabled or is not somebody who needs that technology. And so I think we need to be really careful about that when we're incorporating these technologies.

Facilitator: Thank you so much. So with that, we do... We have a few minutes if either of our speakers would like to say anything around this topic that you didn't get a chance to talk to through these questions or any last words you might have. There's space for that. Oh, and I see Sarah's hand.

Dr. Sara Humphreys (Principal Investigator): Yeah. It's me. I just wanted to first of all say amazing discussion, but also maybe Jason, were you thinking of opening up maybe a few questions if Leila and Jay have a little bit of time? I think there's a lot of really great comments in the chat where we could expand a bit. And the reason I'm saying this is, I'm greedy for data. So all of this is going to be synthesized and put into – and shared – and put into a 40-page report that goes to SSHRC, the Human Genome Project – those are our funders – and then also shared widely across Canada. So, I just think anything else you want to say and then if anybody else has any questions, would that be okay with our, with our wonderful, wonderful interviewees? And thanks, Jason. Thanks for the additions. Thank you so much.

Ferreira: Can I just jump in quickly? I wanted to respond to Julia's comment about the students being critical of GenAI, and that's what I find as well. They have so many questions. Again, people seem to think that the students, university students, are very wily, and they know all about the technology and they know how to use it, and they know exactly how to get it to do what... And this couldn't be further from the case. The students have so many questions, so many concerns. And in everything that we've been doing in the... in terms of the activities trying it to like, does it help with our reading? Does it foster our, you know, note taking? They have been finding that it creates so much time to do those things, and it doesn't do it very well for what we're asking them to do in our classrooms. And so they're kind of realizing, well, my own thinking is actually better because I am thinking in relation to this particular classroom. And I just think we need to be more open with the

students about it and generous with them, and not just assume that they are avid users of this technology because they have lots of concerns and criticisms as well.

Facilitator: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, I... Recently in writing classes, we begin the semester with a discussion of AI. Like, what is? What is its usefulness? And maybe why wouldn't you want to use it? And I just leave that question there. And students have a lot – when you ask them why might you not want to use AI? – they have a lot to say about that. It's... It can get pretty interesting. I agree. I think they are much more critical of AI than the larger, you know, fear conversation around AI allows for.

Sarah, did you? I haven't been able to keep track of the chat. Was there another question that you saw in there that you thought might...?

Humphreys: Yeah, let's see. There's a whole pile of things. So let's... And if somebody doesn't want to open their mic or anything, they can also pop in the chat. There's some discussion about grad studies – that students don't know how to write theses, and you know how to write the dissertation. That it's all a mystery, and that this idea of... or the idea around writing being... it seems like being gated, or students being sectioned off if they don't know how then that's a comment somehow on their intelligence, which is weird. And then let me see, discussion about Sara Ahmed's work and thinking about why we're asking people to write in the first place. Like, why are we doing this in the first place? I don't know if anybody wanted to comment on some of these really great and big, big questions?

Facilitator: Yeah, I like that last one. Why are we asking students to write? If you happen...

Ferreira: I'm not going... I mean, I have so many things to say about why we have them, write. But that's one of the things that we are having the student with the AI project is having one of the activities is having students think about why the heck they write, you know. So why do you write? What is writing for? And really taking it back to writing as community building and relationship building. So that seems to be a lot of what it comes back to you so far is, if we're not talking about it with students, it's communicating, sharing information, creating relationships and creating community. And you... AI can't do that, so... You know, kind of thinking about... And they also if you ask them what, yeah, what can you use AI for and what you can't, they have clear ideas around that in terms of what it's doing for the writer and the reader. And the AI cannot do those things. It can perform the function and create this kind of piece of writing. But it's not doing the things that writing actually is doing for us. You know, here, as scholars, but more generally in terms of our writing and communication, more broadly. So those are kind of questions that students come up with.

Dolmage: And I agree with all those things. I think there's probably a lot. I also, you know, I'm not like an expressivist, but I really believe that composing is a heuristic for a certain type of thinking that is really valuable and important. Students are engaged in all kinds of different intellectual labor and they come… they learn how they learn. And they also learn how the accommodations they need to learn and the pathways they need to learn. And they are constantly pushing at those – and writing is one of those ones that's a real pusher, right? It is... It's very... It's even hard work.

During the lockdown, right in that lockdown period, a lot of us, actually for some of the first time like, living in very close proximity. And I think will disavow you, disavow you of your expertise in writing then seeing how other people actually engage and how different it is. Either way, you get the sense for the richness and complexity. And I think the value.

But I think AI is going to… It's going to surface a whole bad kind of teaching. It's going to surface a whole lot of ways. Engage in that way. We need to understand and value the writing that is more difficult, the writing is more student also writing more because. May not be done. I think sometimes we keep on reading. Uh. And that's a big, huge shift.

And then reading how does how does that?

[At this point, the transcription AI could not retrieve approx. 10-12 seconds of audio – in particular, an insight from Dr. Ferreira was lost.]

Humphreys: *Institution. So it becomes really it becomes a factor de. But I think that when hearing here, so it's making me feel seen in the sense....*

Just a discussion [in the chat]. A hot discussion you're reading, but grading is partition and it doesn't help students very much. And Natalie talking about [a pilot] where there was no limit on [submission in] this class, so students would just keep submitting [assignments] until they reached a grade an, A or a B – I'm not sure. The administrator was program because it didn't need. Do so. Requirements for assessment. I'll stop there. Thank you. So much.

Facilitator: Because they get that really lovely grading curve that they demand and think that, like, universities aren't working if we don't have that, right? It's not possible we could become better teachers and that all students could be included… that our courses could be accessible, and yeah. Yeah.

Ferreira: I guess I wanted to just say one more thing. I did see about the teaching them to read. I just would clarify, for me, it's about fostering students' understanding and awareness of their own reading and how… their own practices of reading, right? And how they can mobilize them in order to engage in a writing classroom. And sometimes they

need some guidance and support and strategies to do that. But in terms of grading, I mean, yeah, *I would just love to get a grade*.[2] There's just no way that's going to happen right for us. But what we have been doing, a lot of people in our unit are using, is [...][3] integrated more fully. In my own writing classroom. Students so far are really taking it up. It seemed to be. There are challenges with it for sure. But you know, building on Asao Inoue's work and also colleagues Lou Maraj, Alexis McGee, and Stephen Dadugblor, who have been working in this area in our unit. And that way the focus is more on my giving them feedback instead of on did they meet these particular standards of writing that perpetuate, you know, white supremacist, colonialist approaches. I do still... I've integrated it... I've adopted it a little bit, so I do still have a sort of quality assessment component that I haven't been able to fully get rid of for my own course. But, it... Engaging in those kinds of approaches to assessment have helped to release, for the students, to alleviate the pressures in terms of what an A paper means in terms of their intelligence and their ability to adhere to norms of language. Because so many students come into my classrooms and say they don't know how to write. So it helps to alleviate those kinds of anxieties and pressures on the students. And yes, Lou was... participated in, I think, one of the workshops for this project.

Dolmage: Yeah. And I think I would just add, I think we can take a kind of harm reduction approach to grading, right? I think we can grade less, we can assess differently, right. We can remove some of the high stakes around grading. We can think carefully around, like, what is the labour that's involved in the credit hour? And I just don't think we think about that at all. And I think there's actually been a huge amount of inflation in what a credit hour is, right? But also, that we're adding stakes onto grading that we don't need to. We don't even think very carefully around like the timing of assessment. Most of the assessment that happens on a university campus happens two times a term. Right? And so, we're loading all of the stress – and we have a mental health crisis on our campuses – we're loading all those, all that stress into, you know, two very small windows. Like I said, we're about to do however many... 1200 exams within 11 days, right? Up to Saturday nights at 10:00 PM. So, we actually, like... There's certain things we don't... we know we don't have flexibility around, but then there are certain things we do have flexibility around and yet we don't use it. And so, to me like, it's you know... Cate Denial talks about like "plus one thinking." Like do one thing, a term, right? And let those things compound and experiment with them. But I also think like subtract one thing. Like, take out one assessment, right? Or convert... you know, we did this in one giant class here at Waterloo, but like, we just started giving full marks for anybody who fully engaged in peer review instead of any marks at all for the essay itself, for one, assignment. Right? And like, why not right? We value peer review, right? But students were doing the kind of dramaturgy of peer review instead of engaging with it. Because they knew the real deal was going to come later when they were

going to be assessed by their teacher. So anyway... Just it's little things like. It doesn't have to be a revolution, but we can have a kind of harm reduction approach and a term by term add one, subtract one thinking.

Ferreira: Can I just say one more thing, Jason?

Facilitator: Yeah, absolutely.

Ferreira: I just was to call attention to the work that's required on the part of faculty. I also want to call attention to contingent faculty, contract faculty, and the specific challenges and the limitations that are placed on them in terms of the ways that people want to do this work and they... their contracts are only for a certain amount of time, or they're overloaded with teaching and they do not have time for professional development. I really want to call attention to that. I'm speaking for myself. I was for a long time a contingent faculty. Contract faculty. Now I am assistant professor of teaching, and I have way more resources to do this work. And I think we have to acknowledge that this is happening, and we can talk about this all we want, but until the universities are hiring in ways that are accessible for our faculty, the people teaching the students, this work cannot get done in the way that it needs to be done.

Facilitator: Yeah, I agree. So our last workshop actually focused on this quite a bit: working conditions and contingent working conditions. And here at UVic, our contingent faculty, curricular development is not something they're paid to do. So not only do they likely you know... they might be overloaded, but like that's not even part of their job. Which means that it falls onto, like, the course coordinator to ensure that everyone is able to... has the resources is able to engage in accessible learning, and all of these different kinds of assessment and instruction practices we've been talking about. Which you know, that's the course coordinator's job, but... Yeah. There's still there's a tension there that we need to engage in these courses in increasingly, and we use word complex but *fluid* ways. And for some contingent faculty like that's.... there's definitely a tension there.

Alright. So I think we're getting close to time. So if either of you have like a last word. Great. But there's no pressure to, like, have that last word.

Dolmage: I'm good. I think people are me talk enough.

Ferreira: The only thing I didn't locate myself and I just wanted to acknowledge that I'm here attending this meeting on the territory's ancestral and unseeded of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Peoples.

Humphreys: I just before we... Sorry before we close the recording, I just wanted to let our interviewees know something. I'm going to jump in and interrupt Jason and be rude. But

your interviews will be... You know we've recorded them. We will be providing the audio and a transcript, and depending on the permissions given, these will be going up on our Open Access site, which will be available in January for everyone to learn from. But we will be taking from these interviews and the chat and the upcoming discussion, and this will add to that 40-page report which we will share with you a draft of, so that you can have a chance to take a look what we've said and add anything else or take away, or let us know if we've done something to misrepresent you in any way. Just thank you so much. Okay. Jason, over to you.

Facilitator: Thanks, Sara. And thank you so much to both of our speakers today.

Interview with Dr. Hannah McGregor, Director and Associate Professor of Publishing (SFU), Part Two[8]

Facilitated by Natalie Boldt (UVic)

August 23rd, 2024

Interview Questions

- There is a great deal of fear around GenAI at the moment. What kinds of support do you think writing instructors, support staff, and administrators need to provide students a safe and inclusive learning environment?
- How does technology create barriers in academic environments? Let's reverse the question, how can technology provide greater access?
- What does accessibility mean to you in writing classrooms and writing centres?
- How does technology or lack thereof further systemic oppression in writing classrooms?

Transcript

Interviewer: Yes, OK. So, I've sent you a list of draft interview questions, and you really generously offered to speak to two of our themes. Did you have a preference for which theme you wanted to start with? It was *citational justice*, and then the other one was *accessibility and technology*.

McGregor: I don't have a preference. Either one's fine.

Interviewer: OK.

[8] See Appendix A for Part One.

McGregor: This is useful, huh?

Interviewer: I mean, since we're on Zoom, maybe technology?

McGregor: Sure.

Interviewer: OK. Here we go! So, there is a great deal of fear around Gen AI[1] at the moment. What kind of supports do you think writing instructors, support staff, and administrators need to provide students with a safe and inclusive learning environment?

McGregor: Ohh so you know the first and foremost concern that I have around the conversation happening in universities about Generative AI right now is that it is encouraging people to sort of amplify the policing of student behaviour in classrooms, and particularly the submission of student work to unbelievably reliable AI checkers. And we know that there's lots of problems with those AI checkers. They're not... They're not good, for one thing. You know, they're likely to penalize students whose English is not their first language if they're, you know, using digital tools to help them translate stuff. You know, it's more likely to ping them. But also a lot of those tools are using everything submitted to them to train their own AI. And students have not consented to have their work submitted to those tools. Often, you know, in the context of BC, we've got very strict privacy laws, often submitting student work to those trackers or those checkers violates privacy laws, and I think that desire to sort of crack down and find policing-based solution comes out of a kind of panic because the technology is changing so quickly and universities change slow, so people are not and were not prepared for the speed with which they would have to do things like rethink their assignments, rethink the place that writing has in their classrooms, rethink their relationship to AI, for example. You know it's just very, very fast, and I think it, makes perfect sense that that causes a kind of panic.

And so, my advice is that as people are thinking about how to both redesign their courses and support students in doing their work is that you take a values-first approach rather than a technology-first approach. So, taking that step back and saying OK what am I actually trying to teach students how to do? How do I want to treat students? What kinds of relationships do I want to have with them in the classroom? What do I think is important about the assignments that I have historically given them? And what kind of relationship would I like my students to have to AI. And that one's really crucial to me because I think generally the attitude of, sort of, fear and avoidance is counterproductive. The reality is, for better or for worse – I think mostly probably for worse – AI is quickly infiltrating every industry and sending students into the world with a total inability to use AI thoughtfully and rigorously is not going to be serving them well, and so one of the really primary things we have to be thinking about is, like, how do we actually incorporate teaching AI thoughtfully

into our classrooms? And that's particularly important in classrooms where we're teaching students to write, because it's going to be one of the primary composition tools moving forward. And so teaching students how to use it thoughtfully, intentionally, transparently, when it's appropriate to use it and when it's not, what the ethical ramifications of using AI are in different genres and different industry settings – *that,* seems to me, to be significantly more vital at this stage than trying to outsmart people using [Gen]AI.

Interviewer: Yeah, totally. I love that. And I love the idea of a values first approach. That's both profound and simple. Or maybe not necessarily simple in practice, but...

McGregor: It's really helpful when you're facing like, really rapidly trend-shifting scenarios, right? Like I can't, I don't know how to deal with this, but like taking that step back and saying like what's most important for me, you know, my top classroom value is trust, and I don't think you create a culture of trust by assuming that your students are cheating. Right? So, like if we start there, then how do we move forward?

Interviewer: Yeah, absolutely. I work at a writing centre and one of the things that we've been talking about is how do we support students navigating AI. And one of the things that we've talked about I think falls within this idea of a value-based approach where you're like, OK, well, if we're thinking about, can I use this tool in this context, am I circumventing a learning outcome? So, if I'm going to harm my learning or the learning that is ostensibly supposed to happen in this course – the values that are, I guess, espoused by the syllabus – then maybe it's not a great idea to use this tool.

McGregor: Yeah.

Interviewer: OK. [Question 2:] How does technology create barriers in academic environments, and then we can also reverse the question: how can technology provide greater access?

McGregor: Yeah. You know, it's really interesting to me how much teaching, like actual classroom practice, has shifted my relationship with students using technology. Because I definitely started off as a like "I shouldn't see your cell phone." You know, like that was sort of the attitude I began with. And very quickly I realized ohh... people are using their cell phones to look up words. They are using their cell phones to translate. Things that I am saying they are using their cell phones to make notes. They are... The relationship that people have to technology is really significantly more complex than "you're on TikTok." And I think the over restriction of technology can create barriers, you know, in a similar way to over reliance on technologies – that's always going to be a challenge if you're teaching something that requires students to have particular kinds of hardware, and you can't assume that they have that at home. You know, that's a conversation that we have to have

a lot because in the publishing program we teach students how to use InDesign and the Adobe suite is expensive. So just like, how do we make sure that people have access to the literal tools that they need and not assume that they can afford to pay whatever outrageous monthly cost Adobe is currently charging people?

What particularly strikes me, though is that there's an opportunity to incorporate technologies more thoughtfully and intentionally into classes that turns them into useful teaching tools and reduces barriers for students. And I'm thinking about things like... when I want my students, I often want my students to do stuff with pen and paper. And so, when I want my students to do stuff with pen and paper, I bring a big bag of pens and paper. Because nobody has [pens and paper] with them anymore. And I've gone pretty far in the direction of, like, carrying a huge sack of crafts supplies to class because, you know, I want us all to write something down together, or draw something together, or make zines together, and I'm not, like, right from the get-go, going to assume that people have a thing in their pocket that's going to let them do that. But I'm also... [pause]. When you treat technology as a.. how do I put this... as transparent and not having an impact on the way that students work and the way that they learn, you end up doing things like "grab your phone or your laptop or a piece of paper or whatever and let's do this" as opposed to saying, "we're all going to use this thing together ,and as we use it, we're going to think about how it's impacting what we're doing."

Interviewer: Yeah.

McGregor: Yeah. So I think, in both senses, in the sense of how technology creates barriers and how it opens up possibilities, I think a really intentional incorporation of thoughtful engagement with whatever technologies you're using, right? Asking yourself what technologies we'll be using in this classroom? How will I ensure that everybody has access to them and knows how to use them, or that I'm teaching them how to use them? Not only gets people to... or, like you know, reduces barriers for people actually doing the work, but also becomes a really useful learning outcome that you're, like, actually encouraging people to think about the technologies they use and how they impact what they create.

Interviewer: Yeah. Yeah. What's the message in the medium.

McGregor: Yeah, that's the one.

Interviewer: Yeah, like a really practical question: How do you, in a publishing program, suss out, I guess, whether students have access? Like, do you send around a survey, or...?

McGregor: Oh my God. We're trying to do that right now, and it's really tricky. So, we're revamping the computer lab that we used to teach design courses, and we're trying to

figure out if we need, you know, ... The cap for breakout groups is 21 students, and we're trying to figure out if we need 21 computers in the teaching labs or if people bring their own laptops. Right? And it's like, you know, it's a cost thing and it's a lot some students, sort of, anecdotally, some students really prefer to bring their own laptops and say just plug them into a monitor so they have a bigger monitor to work on – but that is anecdotal from instructors, and we're trying to figure out how many computers do we actually need versus how many like monitors with plugins. And it's really, it's really hard to figure it out.

Interviewer: Sort of like, if everyone came with their own car to this concert or conference, would the parking lot be big enough?

McGregor: Yes, yes, exactly. And it's hard. It's so hard to predict, and it varies, and you want to default to making sure that everybody's going to have access to the technology that they need, but also, you know, space is limited, resources are limited. It's hard.

Interviewer: Yes, it's hard. I don't envy you. OK, [Question 3:] what does accessibility mean to you in writing classrooms and writing centres? Or I would say maybe we would augment that to say, a publishing program.

McGregor: You know, within the context of the publishing program, it means, sort of two major things. One is analyzing the way that shifting laws and policies and frameworks in Canada are demanding a new skill set on the part of publishing professionals. For example, Heritage Canada has essentially legislated that all publishers will have to make their back catalogues accessible. And what that means is accessible epubs, because that's the, you know, the format that renders a book accessible to the greatest possible number of users. And there are very few people who are trained in how to make accessible e-pubs, and the publishers themselves don't have the human capacity, the hours, the skill sets. So, on the one hand, there is this really significant skill gap that, like... the policies are shifting to say you can't just make things that a huge portion of the population can't access anymore if you are funded by the government, right? So these policies apply only to. publishers that receive funding, right? I *think* they only apply to publishers who receive funding. But, you know, it's a, it's a thing that the government can say: if we're going to fund you, you have to make everything accessible because we are funding you, and everything that you make has to be accessible to all Canadians. And we're just, you know, the industry is not keeping up with that yet.

And then when we think about the role that education plays in training people with those really vital skills, the reality is that post-secondary education is still profoundly inaccessible for disabled people who are also the most likely to be passionate about accessibility and bring in the skills and the community connections and the excitement to

push this work forward, which is, you know, part of that like cascading problem of lack of trained professionals – is that, like, the places where we train people are themselves deeply inaccessible. And, for me, building accessibility into a program, into a classroom, into a writing centre, really is about. Pushing beyond the legal requirements of accessibility that your institution mandates and doing what you can to build it into your courses as a baseline and build it into your organizations as a baseline.

And that's, you know, definitely easier said than done. We had a student in the Master's of Publishing last year – no, two years ago – who is blind, and the number of resources, tools, exercises, assignments, documents, everything that we had to revamp, revisit, reconsider was enormous, right? Like just the default assumption of sightedness at every stage of the way that the university is structured, the way that our own programs and classes are structured, was daunting, and I would say we did a pretty mediocre job of accommodating her. And, you know, the other thing that really struck me was, like, she was so good at navigating the complexities of accommodation systems, and it's like a second job on top of being a student.

Interviewer: Yeah. An expert.

McGregor: Yeah. And I kept thinking, you know, every time I interacted with her and was like, "wow, you're really good at this," I would then think of all of the people who couldn't get to this stage because they couldn't be both a student and a full-time accessibility expert. And what an expectation. What a demand. And so when we think about things like you know, "I will accommodate students if I receive an e-mail from the Centre for Accessible Learning, but will do nothing else" – it's so totally the bare minimum. And I mean, some people don't even do that bare minimum. Do you know how often universities get sued because professors refuse to accommodate students?

Interviewer: I think I probably don't know.

McGregor: It's wild. People are just out here being like, "no." Like what? And my argument is that even just saying yes is insufficient. Right? Making students navigate those systems in the first place… that should be, like, a worst case scenario, right? A best case scenario should be that you've already designed your class to be as accessible as possible. And you know, I've got things I do in my classes that are… Like, where my strength lies in terms of accessibility tends to be around mental health because that is where a lot of my own knowledge and expertise lies. And so, you know, like I said, I recognize that when I have students who have disabilities that I have not taught before, you know, I will often come in without the skills that I wish that I had and without the preparation I wish that I'd done. But, trying to begin from the premise that your class should work for everyone always strikes me

as a better baseline than “I'll do what I've always done, and if somebody tells me I have to do something differently, I will begrudgingly do that.”

Interviewer: Right. Right. Right. Yeah. Do you think that... So having had this experience with a student who had a very specific set of needs that, maybe, the program or individual professors hadn't thought of before... is an approach going forward now that you think of really specific needs that are possibilities as opposed to theories, and then you kind of think about how to design the course from the ground up with those specific people in mind? Maybe I'm not being specific enough...

McGregor: Yeah. No, no, I totally get it. It's like, how do you, how do you make something as accessible as possible, recognizing that you won't necessarily know what accessibility needs a particular student has coming in. And that, again, for me goes back to thinking about how you design your courses in terms of values, learning outcomes, right, overall, sort of like pedagogical structures, rather than a series of assignments or a series of tasks that they have to go through, right? So if you have thought right from the get go, like, I am trying to get my students to learn this thing, and so to learn this thing, I'm going to have them do this, this and this. And if a student comes and they can't do this, this and this, but I've already begun from “well, I know what I'm actually trying to teach you.” Right? Like I know that the thing that I'm actually trying to teach you is not how to use a specific word processing tool. What I'm trying to teach you is how to synthesize knowledge and express it in your own words. So that's what I'm trying to teach you. There's no reason that I can't shift to, like, we'll sit down and have a conversation about what you've learned in the class. Right? Because if that's the actual outcome... If I'm trying to teach writing, it's a different thing. But, like, I'm often not assigning written work because I'm trying to teach writing. I'm assigning written work because I'm trying to teach synthesis, self-expression, critical thought. So it's easier to pivot if you begin from knowing what it is that you are trying to teach students and what relationship your assignments have to that learning outcome.

Interviewer: Right. Because the outcome is not flexible, but the way that you get to the outcome can be flexible, yeah.

McGregor: Exactly. There's lots of ways to get to particular outcomes.

Interviewer: Right. Yeah, that's great. OK. The last question in this section [question 4] is how does technology, or a lack thereof, further systemic oppression in writing classrooms, or classrooms more generally?

McGregor: Yeah, I mean... It is a pretty straightforward relationship in the sense that when we assume that students are going to come into our classes with not only access to particular technologies, but experience using those technologies, what we are actually

assuming is that our students will come from a particular cultural and socioeconomic background. Often the same as our own. Right? And so, I'm assuming that students come in...

I used to teach English before I moved to the publishing program, and I would really, really assume that students knew how to use Microsoft Word. And so, I would teach MLA formatting and be like, yeah, your Works Cited needs a hanging indent. And some students knew exactly what a hanging indent was and how to achieve it on a Word document, and some students had no idea what was happening and no clue how to accomplish that thing. And I wasn't teaching it as a skill. I was just telling them it was an expectation. And right there we've got this small task that for some students is going to be so easy and for others it's going to be so stressful and take up so much room in their brain. And the students who are more likely to know how to do it, or to have a parent at home who knows how to do it, are going to be students who come from wealthier backgrounds whose parents are also university educated who have access to technology at home. Not first-generation students whose parents might have no familiarity with technology, who might not be able to afford technology in the household, who might, right, who might have never opened Microsoft Word before the first time you told them that that's the format you expect their essay to be in – and those levels of experience and levels of access technology map very closely to other forms of structural oppression, right to class, to race, to ability to... you know, being first generation university students versus like...

I'm still shocked every time I see the stats about how many people with PhDs have parents who also have PhDs. It's something really shocking, like 70%. It's so high. And it's because academia relies so deeply on arriving with a set of knowledge that you are never taught. And so the assumption that you will have been taught that stuff at home and that extends significantly beyond technologies, but technologies are a are a major part it as well for. It's why I really like teaching students things that I'm fairly certain nobody will have ever done before. It gets everybody on the same playing field.

Interviewer: Yeah. Let's just level them all down.

McGregor: Yeah. Yeah, none of you know how to do this. Let's get started.

Interviewer: Yeah, teaching in September is always wild too. So I when I do teach, I teach first-year writing courses and so, the students, they're like brand new. They're so new. They're so keen. They're there before I am, and you start and you assume all these things, like that they know how to access Brightspace[2] or what Brightspace is, or like any of those things. And they're all looking at you like, excuse me, what? And they're like, I have an institutional e-mail account? And it's like, oh, yes, okay. Let’s back up a bit.

McGregor: They're like, "I'm here, but I don't even know how I got here."

Interviewer: Yes, seriously. [...]

McGregor: [...] I don't teach first years anymore. We don't have... we're an undergraduate minor only and we only have one first year core and I am not responsible for it. And sometimes I really miss teaching first years.

Interviewer: It is quite a joy. Yes. And watching them forge friendships also is like... Because writing classrooms at UVic are about 30 students. And sometimes that's the smallest class that they will ever go to. And so, they often bond in ways that are really lovely. But, okay, so that was the last question in the writing, accessibility and technology section. I don't want to take up too much of your time. Do you have time to answer a couple of questions about citational justice?

McGregor: Yup. I've gotten till 11.

Interviewer: Oh, super OK.

Appendix E

Call for Participants

Writing & Power: Positions and Policies for Social Change

Our SSHRC funded project seeks to make postsecondary writing support more inclusive with your help. Those of us who work with students to support their writing regularly confront and challenge oppressive norms that reproduce ableism, whiteness, Standardized English, and colonization (among other intersectional oppressions). These problematic norms are often silently reproduced via various university structures connected to writing (e.g. admissions requirements, grading standards, teaching materials, placement and exit exams, etc.).

Here's where you come in: If you teach writing classes, work as a writing centre tutor, make decisions about writing requirements for students at a college or university in Canada, then you are someone with experience in Writing Studies. You have likely produced reports, teaching materials, curriculum plans, and other studies as part of this work. As we all know, there are few venues to share this unpublished (yet vital) knowledge or "grey literature" in Canada.

The work you do is important, and it needs to be shared. We invite you to participate in our efforts to make what's happening with Writing Studies in Canada more effective and

responsive to the needs of our students and institutions by sharing your "grey literature." The work and insights you share will shed light on what's happening in our classrooms, programs, and institutions by way of four workshops:

- Postsecondary Writing and Citational Justice
- Postsecondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity
- Postsecondary Writing, Accessibility and Technology
- Postsecondary Writing and Working Conditions

We ask participants to submit at least one piece of "grey literature" (such as a course outline, unpublished research, report – see below for more suggestions) and attend the workshop relevant to your submission. Each workshop will feature a keynote speaker and discussion related to the workshop theme with an eye to both sharing and synthesizing this knowledge. The outputs of these workshops will be in the form of position statements, policy briefings, and relevant open-access resources that practitioners and administrators can adapt to evolve their approaches to writing instruction and support. Let's create resources that will benefit us all!

Workshops

"Postsecondary Writing and Citational Justice" (September: dates and times TBA) invites participants to share how they work to reverse racist and exclusionary research practices through their methods or research and writing as well as how they help students understand and practice inclusive research.

"Postsecondary Writing, Belonging, and Identity" (September: dates and times TBA) asks participants to discuss how they use writing instruction to foster belonging in postsecondary classrooms, specific discourse communities, and in a larger community of scholars and writers.

"Postsecondary Writing, Accessibility and Technology" (October: dates and times TBA) gathers experts to critically examine the relationship between technology and accessibility, with an eye towards developing insights into opportunities (multimodality, accessibility, digital literacy) and challenges (academic integrity) for writing instruction.

"Postsecondary Writing and Working Conditions" (October: dates and times TBA) asks participants to discuss the state of labour, including its precarity, that is foundational to writing instruction and support in postsecondary institutions in Canada.

What Can I Submit?

The following is not an exhaustive list, but here are some suggestions for submission (please note that these submissions are not listed in order of importance):

Academic Integrity policies
Accessibility policies and statements
Anti-racism statements
Artificial Intelligence tools policies
Assessment methods
Assignment instructions/options
Blog posts
Conference papers
Course design materials
Course outlines
Dissertations (or excerpts)
Funded or unfunded grant proposals
Info about admissions, placement, tracking data
Learning outcomes statements
Mission statements
Program assessment summaries
Proposals
Training materials (for TAs, RAs, multi-section courses)
Tutoring materials
Reports
Unpublished research
White papers

And anything you think would be helpful.

Submission Information

Deadline: Submissions are accepted until Monday August 9th.

Please submit using this form (housed on servers in Canada): Submission Form

Appendix F

Writing & Power: Artefact Breakdown[9]

Research Materials	
Toolkits, Guides, and Resource Repositories	7
Research/Grant Proposals and Project Briefs	7
Academic Posters, Conferences Papers/Presentations	5
Workshops and Instructional Presentations	8
Personal Essays/Reflections	1
Dissertation Excerpts	1
Unit/Program Statements or Policies	1
Subtotal	**30**
Teaching Materials	
Syllabi & Syllabus Excerpts	12
Lecture/Instructional Slides	4
Assignment/Activity Guidelines	21
Tutor Training Materials	7
Subtotal	**42**
Interviews	
Panel Interviews	4
Private Interviews	4
Subtotal	**8**
TOTAL	**80**

[9] This count includes artefacts that were submitted but not uploaded to the semi-public repository (i.e., submissions flagged for review and/or deemed inappropriate for upload).

Writing & Power: Participant Breakdown by Institution[10]

Province	Institution	# of Contributors
British Columbia (8)	Kwantlen Polytechnic University	1
	Royal Roads University	1
	Simon Fraser University	2
	Thompson Rivers University	1
	Trinity Western University	2
	University of British Columbia	10
	University of British Columbia, Okanagan	3
	University of Victoria[11]	4
	Subtotal	**24**
Alberta (5)	Alberta Library	1
	Burman University	2
	Mount Royal University	1
	University of Alberta	1
	University of Lethbridge	1
	Subtotal	**6**
Saskatchewan (0)	n/a	n/a
Manitoba (1)	University of Winnipeg	1
	Subtotal	**1**

[10] This list includes (1) keynote interviewees (*note that some keynotes participated in the breakout portion of the workshops and/or attended additional workshops as participants and/or submitted materials to the repository) and (2) participants who volunteered materials but did not attend any of the synchronous workshops.

Finally, this list may be missing participants who expressed interest and were invited to participate in the project at a much later date and, therefore, did not submit materials to the repository.

[11] Other than project collaborator Dr. Erin Kelly, the research team is not included in this number.

Ontario (5)	Carleton University	1
	University of Toronto	2
	University of Toronto-Mississauga	5
	University of Waterloo	2
	Wilfrid Laurier University	2
	Subtotal	**12**
Quebec (0)	n/a	n/a
PEI (0)	n/a	n/a
New Brunswick (1)	Mount Allison University	1
	Subtotal	**1**
Nova Scotia (1)	Mount St. Vincent University	1
	Unaffiliated	1
	Subtotal	**2**
Newfoundland (0)	n/a	n/a
Territories (Yukon, NWT, Nunavut) (0)	n/a	n/a