

SECTION 2. PEDAGOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the second section of this collection, we focus on the generative and collaborative spaces of WAC classrooms and writing centers to investigate issues of pedagogy, including those that promote diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice (DEIJ). The chapters included in this section explore how faculty are teaching writing through critical reflection and creative nonfiction. They consider the implications of algorithms that structure our engagement with student work, from learning management systems to disciplinary genres, and they propose and describe innovative theories and curricula that support students in learning and growing as writers. The authors in this section provide valuable reflections on the past, present, and future of WAC approaches to instructing and engaging student writers.

Opening this section, **Julie Birt** and **Christy Goldsmith** consider the definition of critical reflection as it is taught through the writing-intensive (WI) courses at their institution. They mention how the 2015 University of Missouri student protests and the 2016 presidential election prompted them to think critically about their dataset of WI course proposals and, specifically, the role that writing can have in (re)shaping cultures of teaching and learning. In an analysis of assignment prompts and instructor reflection, their research examines the varying ways reflective writing is defined and used in writing-intensive courses as well as ways to leverage reflective writing to promote inclusive teaching across the disciplines. Birt and Goldsmith's chapter matters as WAC continues to ask how writing can impact the changing conditions of teaching and learning on our college campuses. For example, they observe how WI course proposals favored argumentative writing over reflection. We find their observation notable because, at a time of social and political unrest, they recognized within the course frameworks how arguing without reflection can be a missed opportunity for students to grapple with their own experiences, knowledges, and beliefs including the ways in which their arguments are shaped. Birt and Goldsmith's chapter reminds us of what reflective writing can do in strengthening student learning across the disciplines because it is an asset for students to evaluate the processes underlying the conversations they join.

Continuing the theme of reflective composing, **James P. Austin** argues for incorporating elements of creative nonfiction (CNF) into our pedagogical approaches in order to encourage student learning in the disciplines by writing from a personal disposition. Drawing from his teaching experience in Egypt, Austin's chapter identifies opportunities for creative writing approaches in the transfer of

learning by using CNF to support students' understanding of their own learning processes and themselves within their learning processes. This work is important to consider as WAC examines innovations in teaching and learning that include what it means to value the assets, resources, and experiences of all students as they engage writing in the disciplines through multiple modes of writing.

Using personal narrative to convey their varied and various experiences within educational contexts, particularly in writing centers, **William J. Macaulay, Jr.**, **Pamela B. Childers**, and **Brandall C. Jones** reflect on the critical role that writing centers have and can continue to play in creating equitable learning environments. Macaulay et al. recognize how writing centers—often safer spaces that promote diverse discourses across campus—are also where WAC work happens. In this chapter, Jones describes his high school writing center, which was directed by Childers, as “the space that welcomed my unique self” (p. 130), and he acknowledges the role of this space in his own personal development, leading him to an accomplished career in the arts. The authors end by offering concrete suggestions for how to take an antiracist and inclusive approach to WAC-based writing center work. They use narrative to chronicle a welcome yet unexpected outcome of their IWAC 2020–21 collaboration: getting to know each other's perspectives on a deeper level.

Shifting focus to the digital spaces in our classrooms, **Kathleen Daly Weisse** addresses the use of big data in higher education for measuring student learning and questions the problematic ways in which learning management systems (LMS) assess student participation. In her chapter, Weisse critiques the use of these “digital traces,” particularly in Canvas, and makes a powerful argument for WAC practitioners: “the problem is that assessing learning with these technologies demands that learning itself be re-defined and reconfigured so as to be measurable by such a tool” (p. 145). She cautions that faculty need to think twice before relying on prescribed indicators of learning. Her critiques are significant to WAC because they reveal the assumptions related to participation that can be consequential to learning assessment and student outcomes. As WAC seeks to lead discussions and practices of pedagogical innovation, addressing assumptions of student participation that can be framed by digital learning platforms will become increasingly important for how we discuss assessment at our colleges and universities.

In conversation with Weisse, **Angela J. Zito** concludes this section with an exploration of how disciplinary genres function similarly to LMS algorithms, thereby influencing our pedagogical practices and assessments. Using the literary analysis essay as a case study, Zito interviews English instructors and interrogates how teaching of these conventions leads to the perpetuation of inequitable, racist, colonial assessment practices. This chapter illustrates how “disciplinary genre conventions can conceal as well as reveal aspects of student learning” (p. 166) and must be used carefully and thoughtfully when used to assess non-writing student learning outcomes.