INTRODUCTION

Aurora Matzke

Chapman University

Genesea M. Carter

Colorado State University

The seeds of this collection were planted in 2017, when we (Genesea and Aurora), along with several of our friends, started having conversations with our colleagues about how systems and networks affect, shape, or prevent the institutional and programmatic change-making efforts in our profession—everything from academic labor issues and workplace boundaries to inclusive assessment benchmarks and equitable service requirements. These conversations culminated in our Conference on College Composition and Communication's (CCCC) 2018 panel, "Seeking Justice for Basic Writing and English Language Administration through Networked Theories." Simply put, our goal of that panel was this: acknowledging that citing best practice was not cutting it when we tried to work toward equity and inclusion within our administrative roles. But what was working? Openly talking about, applying, and working through various program issues within the context of system and network theories. At our panel, we suggested that rhetoric and composition administrators—who we define as any faculty, staff, or students engaged in writing program, writing center, writing and language, and/or writing across curriculum/communities administrative work—pivot their focus from the individual (themselves and their expertise) to the system and networks shaping their work. During the panel, one of the attendees said, "You all really need to publish something on this. I don't think there's anything quite like it out there."

Leaving CCCC 2018, we continued to apply system and network theories to better understand and navigate our own institutional contexts. We began closely examining the systems and networks impeding or confining the disciplinary best practices and change-making efforts we wanted to enact. We focused on the systems and networks stalling the equitable hiring practices we wanted to adopt; we examined the systems and networks prohibiting the inclusive and diverse curriculum redesigns we wanted to make; we tried to shift the systems and networks stopping our efforts at reducing overwork and burnout; we studied the systems and networks prolonging our efforts to update assessment practices to honor students' positionalities and intersectionalities. As writing program administration,

writing center administration, and writing across curriculum/communities scholarship has shown, it is downright challenging—and sometimes impossible—to do meaningful work, sometimes *because of* the existing systems and networks that define the parameters of our jobs, our spheres of influence, our resources, and our agency. It is with these passions, commitments, and frustrations we were determined to have "naming and changing conversations" with our colleagues and stakeholders to define and work through university systems and networks that impacted or impeded efforts toward meaningful change. Since 2018, we have kept coming back to networks and systems frameworks to help us unpack, expose, and demystify the roadblocks getting in the way of our work: the disciplinary and institutional conversations and efforts, the intra-campus initiatives, and the personal and relational changes (and boundaries) in which we invested.

Networks and systems impose agency or act like agentive beings in that they may shape how rhetoric and composition administrators work, impose deficit-based pedagogies or approaches, stifle emotional and physical well-being, and/or perpetuate problematic labor practices (Boylan & Bonham, 2014; Otte & Mlynarczyk, 2010; Poe et al., 2018). This collection compiles and presents efforts that have led rhetoric and composition program administrators to confront and respond to networks and systems that problematically affect administrative work, disciplinary best practices, curriculum design, working conditions, and change-making efforts.[1] We do not offer a one-size-fits-all approach, as institutions, networks, and systems are organic and ecosocial. However, one feature of this collection is that contributors have included specific recommendations for readers to try out within their own contexts to further contextualize and mobilize the work outside of local contexts. As a result of our own administrative experiences being shaped by networks and systems (and the intra-campus and disciplinary conversations we were having), we wrote the call for this collection.

This collection is itself a rhizomic system. Within these pages, we intend to show diverse networks existing from macro (national conversations in the field) to micro (the internal well-being of the administrator). The sections and chapters are pieces of the of the academic supersystem and, as such, offer different rhetorical roots: some chapters are research-based case studies, some chapters utilize narrative, some chapters are hybrid genres of multiple authors' conversations. The hope is that the collection gives readers both a taste of the familiar and something that is different from their own normative expectations—be it

---

1   Within the collection, we use the umbrella term "rhetoric and composition administrators/administration" to encapsulate the different administrative work the collection authors wrote about, including WPA work, Writing Center work, Basic Writing work, WAC work, among other roles. We encourage readers to read each chapter with eyes towards the possibilities of what each chapter might offer their particular contexts and roles.

genre, voice, or argument.

The collection contains experts and researchers of and from various gender identities, socioeconomic statuses, races, religions, and professional levels. Because of the purposeful inclusion of diverse experts, voices, and academic backgrounds—and because this collection is an exercise in pushing against established systems that stifle our work, our identities, and our values—we encouraged the collection authors to rhetorically use mediums of writing that incorporate, bend, or push back against historically normative expectations of academic writing. We intentionally showcase various ways to interpret, experience, and resist networks and systems. Try to enjoy this. Allow yourself to notice and make note of any homecoming or resistance you may feel as a reader, and ask yourself: is this not the very nature of systems?

SYSTEMS, NETWORKS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

Systems and network theories offer us lenses for problem-solving because they allow us to zoom both out of and into the complexities within our work. In a salient article, Patricia Ericsson et al. (2016) cited ecosocial systems theory as going "beyond a linguistic or a language-based approach and demands that community (and communication) be viewed in its complexity" (para. 8; see also Inoue, 2015, and Carter et al., 2023). At the same time, in the past decade or so, different liberal arts, particularly rhetoric, writing, and language studies, have been making a turn toward object-orientation and materiality within the social, including applications of Bruno Latour's phenomenological framework (see, for instance, Lynch & Rivers, 2015). For example, to understand how new programs and initiatives focused on equity-based practices might find traction in increasingly tight budgetary situations, we believe systems and network theories in particular—which consider time, place, culture, actors, agentive beings (both human and non) to name just a few—might be deployed by rhetoric and composition administrators as they act as change agents to strategically maximize educational opportunity.

As networks and systems collapse, are built, and collapse again under differing leadership structures, power-dynamics, and availabilities, rhetoric and composition administrators frequently step into the gaps. These are the spaces between, alongside, and absent from the (often) hegemonically-mapped, complex ecosocial systems comprised of smaller-scale systems and networks within our colleges and universities. These include, but are not limited to, academic departments, administrative offices, student-support programs, co-curricular committees, university facilities, students, faculty, and staff. Many of the groups make decisions that influence, support, and/or downright consternate rhetoric and composition administrative work, such as where classes are held,

course caps, when courses are offered; how much money will be budgeted toward ongoing teaching and professional development initiatives; if student success initiatives will feature sound writing pedagogies and practices; whether or not there is a university-wide interest in supporting anti-racist or decolonizing pedagogies; how textbook selection or open access materials are or are not supported; and the list goes on. Writing program administrative (WPA) work, for example, plugs directly into campus-wide conversations in ways not easily felt or understood by all faculty or administrators. That is one of the reasons why some institutions struggle to fully fund WPA work and why the field has spent a considerable amount of time and research energy connecting itself to industry, retention, and academic promotion. This "everywhere but nowhere" problem, we would suggest, is connected to a lack of systemic thinking, rhetorical listening, and networked doings beyond the scope of the discipline.

Rhetoric and composition administrators step into the gaps to (re)build, collapse, interrogate, and problematize programs. We develop curricula, positions, policies, and practices based on educational home point standards, best practices in language acquisition and writing, and on current educational research at large. We may embed this work in English departments, alongside freestanding writing programs, in our writing centers, or our local and national organizations. We work to include and reach out toward key university ecosystems and networks (in addition to the ones in which we are immediately nested): linguistics, modern languages, communication studies, global student development, and their attendant professional organizations; admissions, advising, registrar, marketing, student support services, and several stakeholder academic programs; upper administrators, including deans, vice provosts, and the provost and senior vice presidents; and community partners, businesses, and local action groups.

Our administrative work naturally moves us in these directions, as we persist in forming connections in concert with our communities. As Aurora has stated elsewhere with our contributor Bre Garrett (2018), this is why after a year of being on the campuses of their respective first WPA positions, they knew more campus stakeholders than many of their colleagues. In this collection and elsewhere, we actively encourage WPAs to put out the welcome mat as much as possible. For example, it is a lot harder to get those course caps raised on you at the 11th hour if your enrollment and marketing leader knows the research: you are going to lose students at a higher rate once you pass certain capacities. They do not want to waste their recruitment efforts any more than you want to waste student time or burn out your faculty. Sure, it is best practice, and sure we should be listened to about that. But really, institutions have many competing interests, and a successful administrator will create connections among the systems to make the most nuanced argument possible at any given time.

When we examine this work as part of larger systems, as guided by ecosocial and networked systems frameworks, the stakeholder constituencies understand each other not just as related entities, inorganic rooms that touch impermeable walls within buildings; but rather they understand each other as vital, dynamic ecosystems within the eco-supersystem with knowledge growing and interchanging not through rigid hierarchies but rather organically, *rhizomatically*. Therein lies the power of ecosocial systems and network language.

Let's look at an example. Administrators spend an enormous amount of time interacting with others through technology. We know that almost all systems-based change for academic administrators involves mediation through technological tools. Consequently, understanding these actions as ones that are mediated by non-human agents (technology) through the work of Victor Kaptelinin and Bonnie Nardi (2009, 2018) could be particularly useful for those looking to understand how campus efforts toward change are supported or thwarted by learning management systems (LMS) or scheduling software—say, whether or not the LMS supports individual choice in the use of personal pronouns. In many cases, this is a function that must be "turned on" and integrated within student records. In addition, an emphasis on mediation, when examined from further distance, shows a complex matrix that is nourished or depleted by the human agents and/or actors that exist within, alongside, and outside these technologies and their systems. Essentially, it shows an ecological framework (Kaptelinin & Nardi, 2009). In the example, can your registration and records folx support, with time and energy, the integration of the LMS function, and even if they do, who will explain it to the faculty and the students?

Yet, given that we know humans interact with technology and that actions are mediated, it might be more useful to move to a type of non-human participant that is not as concretely realized in the day-to-day. For example, how might an administrator understand and utilize the concept of "attention" within a system—at what points does the organization and movement of the data require human interaction or use? Nathaniel Rivers (2016) argued, "Attention isn't simply an *a priori* human possession, but is instead a contingent attunement tightly bound to material relations across bodies, environments, media, and other nonhumans" (2016, para. 5). This should sound familiar to the reader, as Rivers is describing an ecosocial system bound by *kairos*. It is an attempt to note when actors are present in particular systems in particular ways via discussion of Latour's conception of "things." Things are the nonhuman actors that shape the conversations, actions, politics, and events within networks and systems (Latour, 2005). Things often "no longer have the clarity, transparency, obviousness of matters-of-fact; they are not made of clearly delineated, discrete objects" (Latour, 2005, p. 13). By placing "thing" in the open context of the environment, Rivers

connects conceptions of "things" to the ecosystem in which they manifest. He posited, "As a Latourian thing, attention is not what's brought to bear on, given, distracted or captured, but rather what is always at stake in any interaction—it is an assembly, and it is one that emerges kairotically" (Rivers, 2016, para. 5). This is the very *thing* the editors of the collection have poignantly observed in our (re)design work. How do we make space for the kairotic interaction that is both mediated and/or denied by both human and non-human actors or agents?

In our analyses, many of the reasons that diversity, equity, inclusion, belonging, and social justice (DEIBSJ) efforts fail is that many parties involved—the program leadership, the instructors, the community or campus stakeholders—are not only functioning in isolation but are also paying little attention to what is happening outside of their immediate ecosystem. For us, attention, and rhetorical listening particularly focused on the inside, alongside, and outside of the given supersystems, is a crucial element in any consensus-based efforts to deconstruct harmful systems. Let us give an example. At one of the many California Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs), there are four different offices, reporting to four different vice presidents, that manage affinity and financial support for students who self-identify as Hispanic, first-generation students. On the one hand, the commitment that each area has to support Hispanic, first-generation students is commendable, and they do provide a myriad of support opportunities. On the other, splitting up the supports under different vice presidents has actually worked to reinforce hegemonic, systematized higher-educational structures because the differing offices are not required to work together or actively share information, strategies, or analytics around effectiveness. The *system as thing*, as assemblage, prevents the very real desire of the agents within the system, because it does not require nor encourage accountability for decision-making and subject positionality awareness beyond the immediate. The DEIBSJ efforts of the people within these offices become constricted by the disconnected networks—the offices and their respective vice presidents—within the larger university system.

Often, rhetoric and composition administrators do not approach higher educational supersystems as a series of internetworked systems and networks. To give another example: one of us once worked for four years to take the word "basic" out of a course. First, they needed department approval; two deans and a year later, they had it. Then, they needed curricular committee approval; one year later, they had it. But wait, there was another curricular committee. Uninvolved with the oversight of this particular course, but with a fairly large interest in controlling entrance "gatekeeping" courses, this committee convinced the registrar to hold the request, so the proposal languished a year—neither approved nor denied. Then, the leadership in both of the previous curricular committees changed over, and those chairs were happy to support the request

in session. Low and behold, four years later, the catalog no longer listed the course as "basic." The story above is not uncommon. It is, however, more than a frustrating glimpse at bureaucracy. To a certain extent, the WPA approached the change of the name as a fairly straight-forward filling out of forms without considering how all of the differing bodies (both organic and inorganic) were a series of internetworked webs. Did the system cause the lag in change, did the WPA (in their ignorance) cause the lag in change, did the chairs cause the lag in change? We could go on, but we think you get our point: they all did and none of them did. Each of these nodes represent a microsystem connected to differing macrosystems that continue to cycle and connect outward. After all, why did one of us want to take "basic" out of the name of the course in the first place? Because of national, disciplinary research.

When we view our administrative work through the lenses of systems and networks, we can initiate an ongoing systems-based analysis of the supersystem we are working within. Let us be clear, we are not arguing disciplinary expertise should be thrown out the window or that carefully crafted research never will work or that subject positionality does not shift the discourse in demonstrable ways. Rather, once we gather the information we need to better understand the moving pieces of the supersystem, such as how the intra-campus and institution move together or how the personal and relational networks move together, we can make better choices about how to move forward, pivot, or resist. With this information, we can build practical tools and strategies that ensure long-term sustainable change. While many aspects of these analytical and experiential processes involve different types of materiality (e. g., program and course proposals; funding streams; social media advocacy; sample syllabi and assignments; classroom spaces; and other tangible or observable artifacts), some of the most pivotal "things" are immaterial. It is not enough to design an educationally and administratively sound program if we're not also considering the network and systems the program will exist within.

Where Does DEIBSJ Fit In?

In much of the rhetoric and composition administration literature, higher educational change efforts are examined as a complex, fluid network of communities of practice composed of people with competing or similar purposes and values (Inoue, 2015; Kinney et al., 2010; Perryman-Clark & Craig, 2019; Rhodes & Alexander, 2014; Ruiz, 2016; Wenger, 1999), and these are indeed helpful frameworks. As a framework, diversity, equity, inclusion, belonging, and social justice (DEIBSJ) are broadly understood to be the active work put toward the examination and advocacy for change in relation to the fair and equitable

distribution of goods, services, access, and opportunity across an identified populace. We draw our broad conception of DEIBSJ from Michael Reisch's definition of social justice in the *Routledge International Handbook of Social Justice*. According to Reisch, enacting social justice "involves envisioning what a just society would look like . . ." and "address[ing] fundamental questions about human nature and social relationships; about the distribution of resources, power, status, rights, access, and opportunities; and about how decisions regarding this distribution are made" (2014, p. 1). These broad definitions, both within the field and beyond, are helpful (but not exhaustive) in situating the different positionalities and approaches taken by the collection authors. Each author highlights the changes (or not) afforded by the systems they work within. As the reader, you also bring frameworks and definitions into your reading, and we encourage you to do so. Collectively, we all take part in moving the discipline toward more equitable practices for all.

This collection extends the discourse on change efforts within the field by drawing connections among the rhetoric and composition administrative work we do, the DEIBSJ values (sometimes competing, developing, or changing) we have, and applying the systems and network theories to examine their impact and how they shape us. Rhetoric and composition administrators' change-making efforts may include, but are not limited to, equitable labor and working conditions, student and/or faculty retention, persistence, promotion and/or successes, tenure or contracted labor requirements, collaborations between and across programs and offices, curriculum development and redesign, program assessment, community outreach, professional development support, mental and/or physical well-being, and responding to current events. These interactions and developments are embodied acts that interact with and participate in potentially sexist, racist, ableist systems and networks that remain unacknowledged even as the actors within these systems and networks want to actively work against oppression. Therefore, the collection is motivated by our sense that rhetoric and composition administrators, and the field at large, would benefit from continuing to work toward understanding and untangling how networks and systems at times supersede administrator, faculty, and student consensus for change (Hayles, 1999; Lemke, 1995; Rickert, 2013).

Furthermore, we deliberately sought authors with a diverse range of administrative experiences, positionalities, intersectionalities, and perspectives in response to calls from Asao Inoue (2015), CCCC (2020; 2021), April Baker-Bell (2020), and others to develop more collections and articles that prioritize anti-racist writing styles and genre conventions. Two of our priorities, as editors, was to not only follow the anti-racist, inclusive frameworks for editing outlined by the WAC Clearinghouse, *Peitho*, *Composition Studies*, and others, but also

to make space for linguistic and genre justice, so we welcomed authors' writing styles and genre hybridity. As a result, this collection includes memoir, narrative, research, theory, vignettes, reflection, and action items, among other genres. The authors and their chapters intentionally represent the unique human sides within a complex supersystem. People cannot be systematized, regardless of how hard neoliberal proponents might try.

We also believe administrators, faculty, staff, and graduate students in the field of rhetoric and composition need tangible recommendations to confront and push back against the networks and systems that seek to constrict equity-based, inclusive education. That said, our and the authors' definitions and applications of DEIBSJ are not singular. And the collection could never claim it to be. The authors in this collection define it broadly and through a situated lens that tells their stories. In an effort to critically consider inequities, many problem-solve by relying on theory to aid their perspective. For example, Erec Smith uses Miguel Castells' network theory to consider our professional networks while John Tassoni relies on Jay Dolmage's "steep steps" theory to analyze the intercampus networks related to basic writing. Additionally, authors offer perspectives from the lens of decolonial theory, critical systems thinking, network analysis, cultural-historical activity theory, neoliberalism, among others. Yet, while you will find heavy theory in some chapters, the collection also makes room for voices and vignettes that reflect historical moments within our field. We embrace these varied approaches because it illuminates the humanness of our administrative work.

The Collection as a Network

To aid in the application and understanding of the systems and network theories, we have three key features meant to demonstrate the human experience of working within systems and networks: (1) we encouraged authors to include vignettes in their chapters, if they believed vignettes would help them tell their stories; (2) we invited authors to play with genre conventions and writing style that honor their intersectionalities and positionalities while also challenging White supremacist writing conventions of the field; and (3) we asked authors to include tangible recommendations at the end of their chapters so readers would have ideas and things to try.

We believe a collection of authors who adopt similar but different genre conventions, theories, and approaches toward change mirrors the complex, dynamic, and diverse strategies taken when working within institutional systems and networks. Some strategies may feel familiar to some readers; others may feel unfamiliar. Our authors' different strategies are meant to help readers connect

with their experiences, and/or acknowledge where experiences and/or insights are disparate, as well as to provide a personal outlet for contributors to express their experiences working in and across systems and networks in ways that best reflect their perspectives.

Additionally, in welcoming authors' diverse approaches to sharing their research and experiences, we are, as some of us have noted elsewhere, naming and claiming the embodied experience when working within systems and networks. As Bre Garrett et al. (2019) wrote:

> By placing embodiment and delivery side-by-side, we compel ourselves and others to remain critically aware of how bodies interplay in communication situations. Imagine the implications for work environments, for community development, if leadership strategies accounted for bodied interactions. In a feminist tradition, embodied delivery invites and celebrates the personal, regarding people as living beings susceptible to health and harm, pain and pleasure. Embodied delivery's focus on difference enables a more careful understanding of bodies as situated in time and place. (p. 275)

At times, embodiment takes center stage. In other chapters, explicit attention to bodies might not be so readily found. However, in all chapters, bodies are there. Bodies are working, whether they are human bodies, bodies of knowledge, systems as bodies, or other kinds of bodies.

Organizationally, we have structured the collection from a macro perspective (our profession at the national level) to a micro perspective (the managerial tasks of the individual administrator). If read from cover to cover, the scope begins broadly with conversations about our national conferences, historical moments in the field, and the closing of the Writing Program Administrators listserv. Next, Section 2 narrows to campus-based work, covering basic writing, FYC, WAC, and the Writing Center. Last, in Section 3, the individual administrator's work—of self-care, scheduling, and archiving—becomes the final focus.

Wayfinding Through the Collection

In this next part of our introduction, we include strategies and approaches for reading the collection and offer author-written abstracts. Additionally, to guide readers through the collection themes, we have developed section introductions with thematic through-lines, more developed chapter overviews, and reflection and discussion questions. One through-line in this collection that you will find—by whatever wayfinding you do to arrive at the chapters you read—is an emphasis on problem-solving and navigating the existing systems and networks

our authors find themselves within. We see our emphasis on our solutions to working within systems and networks as timely, especially as our nation confronts networks and systems relating to COVID-19, systemic oppression, and educational access concerns.

There are three approaches readers might take through the collection: the first approach is to start at the beginning (and here you are!) and work towards the end, as the collection works as a funnel, moving readers from the larger profession to the smaller program to the individual. Reading the collection from start to finish will provide discussions of framing that continue to gain in complexity as the individual subject is progressively addressed in greater detail throughout the chapters.

The second approach is through five thematic road maps, directly below. We know the nature of a collection is that readers most often do not read collections from cover to cover and may be interested in reading the collection like a hypertext. Each section includes an introduction with thematic through-lines and more descriptive chapter overviews to guide readers.

Thematic Road Maps

Reading Map 1: Who Has the Power and What Do They Do with It?

- Kelly Bradbury, Sue Doe, and Mike Palmquist
- John Paul Tassoni
- Lynn Reid

Reading Map 2: Dominance and Resistance

- Bre Garrett and Matt Dowell
- Mara Lee Grayson
- Emily R. Johnston

Reading Map 3: Historical Events in our Profession

- Committee for Change
- Iris Ruiz, Latina Oculta, Brian Hendrickson, Mara Lee Grayson, Holly Hassel, Mike Palmquist, and Mandy Olejnik
- Erec Smith

Reading 4: Map: Re-seeing the Commonplace

- Eric C. Camarillo
- Julia Voss and Kathryn Bruchmann
- Jenna Morton-Aiken

Reading Map 5: Identity and Positionality in the System

- Lucien Darjeun Meadows
- Genesea M. Carter

The third reading approach is a "Choose Your Own Adventure," where readers start anywhere they like based on their interests. This approach works well for readers coming to the collection from the WAC Clearinghouse website or other open sources. We invite you to begin by skimming the abstracts that follow.

With these possible reading strategies in mind, feel free to start your journey. Know that however you decide to make your way through the collection, the chapters are pathways for you: a pathway through the national to the regional discourse, for example, or a pathway from institutional power to personal power, as another example. We hope that however you experience the collection, you take with you the practical application of the systems theories which are discussed therein, try on or play with the recommendations in each chapter, and reflect on your own experiences as administrators and humans living within a world of systems and networks.

CHAPTER ABSTRACTS

Chapter 1. "Purposeful Access: Reinventing Supersystems through Rhetorical Action" by Bre Garrett and Matt Dowell

Drawing on six years of work by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) Disability and Accessibility Committee, accessibility planning for and challenges related to the 2019 CWPA Conference, and public artifacts related to accessibility claims at the Conference on College Composition and Communication 2019, Bre Garrett and Matt Dowell examine the barriers to full-bodied access at academic conferences. In questioning why conference accessibility, both rhetorically and in action, often functions as a retrofit or afterthought, the authors demonstrate how the interconnected supersystems of higher education and hyperableism make the task of increasing conference accessibility difficult. Inaccess to academic conferences, like the CWPA Conference, both prevents those who experience inaccess from full participation in shaping the discipline and detaches the WPA's local work from the larger national systems and networks related to that work. The authors, therefore, conclude by offering specific interventions that position invention, access, and delivery as interrelated rhetorical acts.

Chapter 2. "At a Crossroads: The Committee for Change and the Voices of CCCC" by the CCCC Committee for Change: Bernice Olivas, Janelle

Jennings-Alexander, Mara Lee Grayson, Tamara Issak, Lana Oweidat, Christina V. Cedillo, Ashanka Kumari, Caitlyn Rudolph-Schram, and Trent M. Kays

This chapter blends ten counternarratives from diverse members of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Committee for Change focusing specifically on CCCC 2019 and the Writing Program Administrators listserv (WPA-L) to illustrate how the discipline's structure acts as a limiting, stifling supersystem. The authors interweave their positionalities, intersectionalities, and experiences to expose deeply held racism and biases that do harm in our classrooms, to our students, and to our profession. Rather than a single, individualized narrative, this collective narrative illuminates how personal experiences are a network across spaces, places, and people. As a call to action, the authors demand a shift to antiracist and inclusive practices at all levels within one of the foremost professional spaces in our field.

Chapter 3. "'Help I Posted': Race, Power, Disciplinary Shifts, and the #WPAListservFeministRevolution" by Iris Ruiz, Latina Oculta, Brian Hendrickson, Mara Lee Grayson, Holly Hassel, Mike Palmquist, and Mandy Olejnik

To many members of the discipline of rhetoric, composition, and writing studies (RCWS), the #WPAListservFeministRevolution, so named for the hashtag that circulated as the disciplinary authority of the Writing Program Administrators listserv (WPA-L) was challenged, represented a pivotal moment of resistance and a veritable paradigm shift in the recent history of the field. In this chapter, a collective of co-authors, who take a multi-theoretical and polyvocal approach to reflection and analysis, examine a series of significant events—incidents of racist and sexist rhetoric on WPA-L—that led to this intersectional, antiracist, online (both through the listserv and Twitter), network-based disciplinary movement. Drawing upon actor-network theory and decolonial theory, the co-authors suggest that the White supremacy, misogyny, and inequity that catalyzed the revolution are representative of a longstanding disciplinary paradigm. As well, they consider what those dynamics and the resistance to them tell RCWS professionals about disciplinary history, present, and future.

Chapter 4. "Critiquing the 'Networked Subject' of Anti-racism: Toward a More Empowered and Inclusive 'We' in Rhetoric and Composition" by Erec Smith

By referencing contentious threads in the now-defunct Writing Program Administrators listserv, Erec Smith seeks to prove that the field of rhetoric and composition has not taken a turn toward social justice so much as social

justice—in its manifestations as "identity politics"—has usurped the field, hijacking academic discourse for a monological agenda and a clear willingness to silence others rather than engage them. Smith attributes this to a dire need for a secure base among social justice-oriented teachers and scholars and, as a corollary, the need to censor and censure those they see as threats to that secure base.

Chapter 5. "Basic Writing's Interoffice, Intercampus Actor-Network: Assembling Our History through Dolmagean Analysis" by John Paul Tassoni

Drawing from Jay Dolmage's (2017) legend of steep steps, retrofits, and universal design, John Paul Tassoni charts basic writing (BW) networks at the author's university. The Dolmagean analysis traces competing and aligned interests and activities across the school's history as they relate to "traditional" undergraduate students, diverse constituencies, and the teaching of writing. This history indicates the system of offices, initiatives, and personnel who have (had) a stake in the goals of access, retention, and institutional transformation that can drive BW missions. The author argues that WPAs can use Dolmage's legend to bolster their own interoffice, intercampus networks, to find allies and align missions to better articulate BW's concerns at the center of university business.

Chapter 6. "Outsiders Looking In: Discursive Constructions of Remediation beyond the Academy" by Lynn Reid

Lynn Reid focuses on perspectives about basic writing (BW) from an actor-network beyond the institution, including Complete College America, the popular press, and state legislation. The discourse constructed by these actors about BW emphasizes its implications for impeding student success and has led to widespread efforts toward remediation reform. This chapter examines that discourse and argues that writing program administrators who are responsible for BW courses must be attuned to the nuances of this extra-institutional conversation to advocate successfully for their programs, as the wholesale elimination of BW courses may not provide an inherently equitable option for students in all institutional contexts.

Chapter 7. "Working Within the Rhetorical Constraints: Renovation and Resistance in a First-Year Writing Program" by Mara Lee Grayson

Mara Lee Grayson's chapter explores the intersecting networks and systems at play during a wholescale revision of a first-year writing program. Using critical systems thinking to examine anecdotal and empirical data, Grayson examines how existing systems posed both opportunities and constraints,

describes how individuals worked across formal and informal networks to effect change, and highlights the saliency of ideology as a systematic, structuring force on the program and those who labor within it. Ultimately, this chapter underscores the limitations of programmatic revision without accompanying institutional critique.

Chapter 8. "Negotiating Dominance in Writing Program Administration: A Case Study" by Emily R. Johnston

This chapter documents how the structure of University of California, San Diego (UCSD) compounds what this collection calls the "everywhere but nowhere" problem in writing program administration. Case studying a first-year composition (FYC) program that teaches writing as a tool for interrogating power, UCSD's Dimensions of Culture Program (DOC), Emily R. Johnston reveals how DOC both resists and contributes to dominance as the program's administrators must function within the converging systems of institutional bureaucracies, academic elitism, the capitalist structure of higher education in the United States, and White supremacy. Johnston draws from intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989) to identify DOC's agency and subordination within these converging systems and cultural-historical activity theory (Prior et. al., 2007) to situate DOC in its particular historical, cultural context.

Chapter 9. "Networking Across the Curriculum: Challenges, Contradictions, and Changes" by Kelly Bradbury, Sue Doe, and Mike Palmquist

In this chapter, Kelly Bradbury, Sue Doe, and Mike Palmquist share the story of Colorado State University's gtPathways Writing Integration Project through a lens of activity theory, highlighting the ways in which each of us, over the course of fifteen years, has met with institutional networks that have and continue to inform, shape, and challenge the goals and the work of the project. Readers can glean from their story insights about the complexities involved in undertaking, developing, and maintaining a socially just writing across the curriculum program amidst an array of changing institutional players and forces. While it is in many ways a story of missed opportunities, it is also a story of localized triumphs, perseverance, and long-term dedication to supporting meaningful work happening from the bottom up.

Chapter 10. "The Writing Center as Border Processing Station" by Eric C. Camarillo

Eric C. Camarillo's chapter expands activity theory's application to writing centers and the activity systems in which they exist. The border processing station, especially as it functions in a United States context, is applied as a metaphor to

visualize the hegemonic function of the traditional writing center. To resist this model of writing center practice, Yrjö Engeström's (2015) concept of third generation activity theory is deployed alongside a direct application of this theory to a writing center context. Camarillo argues that applying an activity-theoretical lens can help writing center practitioners to engage with apparent contradictions in their work and to make systemic activities of exclusion or oppression more visible, which better enables writing centers to mitigate the potential for harm. A systems-theoretical lens allows for more efficient problem solving, letting us see the complexities of writing center or, more broadly, writing program work. This chapter also positions writing center work as a part of a larger milieu of writing programmatic work, all of which is ultimately delimited by institutional systems and networks.

Chapter 11. "Voice, Silence, and Invocation: The Perilous and Playful Possibilities of Negotiating Identity in Writing Centers" by Lucien Darjeun Meadows

Focusing on the relational and holistic dimensions of systems theory as relevant to the intra-campus network of the writing center, this chapter considers what happens, and what could happen, when writers or consultants disclose personal identities in the tutoring session. By discussing current conversations on navigating identity in writing centers, offering lived scenarios and resulting reflections on coming out and remaining silent, and introducing the concept of invocation as a generative alternative to self-disclosure, Lucien Darjeun Meadows extends scholarship on social systems and queer theories. This chapter closes with scalable takeaways for writing center administrators and consultants, as well as writing program administrators, who seek to promote positive change through practices of identity-based invocation.

Chapter 12. "Is Resistance Futile?: Struggling against Systematic Assimilation of Administrative Work" by Genesea M. Carter

In this chapter, Genesea M. Carter uses social science and business administration scholarship to highlight how the neoliberal system creates a culture of auditing, workaholism and overwork, and professional identity fragmentation to keep the system running. Using Star Trek's the Borg as a metaphor for neoliberal systematic assimilation, Carter explains why the neoliberal system is hard to resist for rhetoric and composition administrators. However, resistance is not futile. Carter offers readers what she calls a "workplace mindfulness mindset" with specific reflective and boundary strategies that are based in neuroscience, psychology, and mindfulness to help readers identify the ways they need to reclaim their professional and personal agency, first, before taking on the system at the program, department, college, and/or university level.

Chapter 13. "'It's Complicated': Scheduling as an Intellectual, Networked Social Justice Issue for WPAs" by Julia Voss and Kathryn Bruchmann

Scheduling courses and assigning classrooms are common program administrative tasks, ones that, despite their difficulty and labor-intensiveness, have not been widely discussed in the rhetoric and composition literature. This chapter applies a network theory lens to scheduling to deepen understanding of the challenges program administrators face, especially how logics and priorities motivate stakeholders within the scheduling process. Drawing from survey data of directors of 120 North American writing programs, including doctoral-, masters-, bachelors-, and associates-granting institutions, Julia Voss and Kathryn Bruchmann identify seven major scheduling stakeholders: WPAs, department chairs, office administrators, non-teaching offices, upper administrators, software, and instructors that can help or hinder scheduling and classroom assignment equity. Voss and Bruchmann's findings point to the necessity of including program administrators and department chairs in the scheduling process. Additionally, they illuminate the problematic outcomes associated with involving both non-teaching stakeholders and individual instructors in making scheduling decisions. Troublingly, their findings indicate institutional-student characteristics and resources impact scheduling classroom types with inequality manifesting even in the scheduling process.

Chapter 14. "Flexible Framing, Open Spaces, and Adaptive Resources: A Networked Approach to Writing Program Administration" by Jenna Morton-Aiken

Intentionally playing with genre and writing style, Jenna Morton-Aiken uses systems theory, relational architecture, and archival theory to assert that digital and physical archives shape access, agency, and arrangement at all levels of administrative work. Morton-Aiken opens her chapter explaining how she created a self-generated archival network built to survive graduate school and exams while pregnant, which inspired her to rethink the value of archival theory as important to all writing program administrators, even those who don't consider themselves archivists. Namely, archival theory, as a network and system, can (and should be) used as thoughtful conversation about the ways administrators organize institutional history, values, and processes. Answering the editors' call to think about how systems and networks impact equity and can affect positive change in rhetoric and composition programs, Morton-Aiken concludes with tangible recommendations for how administrators might use analog and digital archival approaches to further equity and inclusion.

CONCLUSION

In the years we've been graduate teaching assistants, part-time and full-time instructors or faculty, writing program administrators, writing center directors,

English language acquisition program directors, and under/upper administrators, we continue to think about how the systems and networks we work within, alongside, and against affect equity and positive change for our students, our non-tenure-track faculty, our graduate teaching assistants, our staff, our curriculum, our programs, our communities, and our workloads. We struggle to do our jobs without compromising ourselves and/or others ethically, economically, and/or professionally. We intend for the chapters in this collection to posit new frameworks within 21st-century rhetoric and composition administrative conditions that can work toward progress and justice for all of us, including our departments, our universities, and our professional communities. We are convinced our contributors' examinations of the disciplinary and public networks, the intra-campus and institutional networks, and the personal and relational networks does not just benefit rhetoric and composition administrators, but benefit people involved in and impacted by higher education writ large. Ultimately, the collection authors work together to create a tapestry of application, both large and small, so that others might, too, find solidarity, education, and encouragement in their administrative change-making efforts.

REFERENCES

Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.

Boylan, H. R., & Bonham, B. S. (2014). *Developmental education: readings on its past, present, and future*. Bedford/St. Martin.

Carter, G. M., Matzke, A., & Vidrine-Isbell, B. (2023). Navigating networks and systems: Practicing care, clarifying boundaries, and reclaiming self in higher education administration. In R. Hentschell & C. E. Thomas (Eds.), *Transforming leadership pathways for humanities professionals in higher education* (pp. 81-104). Purdue University Press.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2020). *This ain't another statement! This is a DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice!* National Council of Teachers of English. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/demand-for-black-linguistic-justice

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2021). *Statement on White language supremacy*. National Council of Teachers of English. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/white-language-supremacy

Ericsson, P., Downing Hunter, L., Macklin, T. M., & Edwards, E. S. (2016). Composition at Washington State University: Building a multimodal bricolage. *Composition Forum*, *33*. https://compositionforum.com/issue/33/wsu.php

Garrett, B., Matzke, A., & Rankins-Robertson, S. (2017). Reembodying the positionality of MiddleMAN administrators in higher education. In K. Cole & H. Hassel (Eds.), *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership*. Routledge.

Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. The University of Chicago Press.

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

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. (2009). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interaction design*. MIT Press.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. (2018). Activity theory as a framework for human-technology interaction research. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *25*(1), 3-5.

Kinney, K., Girshin, T., & Bowlin, B. (2010). The third turn toward the social: Nancy Welch's living room, Tony Scott's dangerous writing, and rhetoric and composition's turn toward grass roots political activism. *Composition Forum*, *21*.

Latour, B. (2005). From realpolitik to dingpolitik or how to make things public. In B. Latour & P. Weibel (Eds.), *Making things public: Atmospheres of democracy* (pp. 4-31). MIT Press.

Lemke, J. L. (1995). *Textual politics: Discourse and social dynamics*. Taylor and Francis.

Lynch, P., & Rivers, N. (Eds.). (2015). *Thinking with Bruno Latour in rhetoric and composition*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Matzke, A., & Garrett, B. (2018). Studio bricolage: Inventing writing studio pedagogy for local contexts. In M. Sutton & S. Chandler (Eds.), *The writing studio sampler: Stories about change* (pp. 43-59). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/per-b.2018.0179.2.03

Matzke, A., Rankins-Robertson, S., & Garrett, B. (2019). Nevertheless, she persisted: Strategies to counteract the time, place, and structure for academic bullying of WPAs. In C. L. Elder & B. Davila (Eds.), *Defining, locating, addressing bullying in the WPA workplace* (pp. 49-68). Utah State University Press.

Otte, G., & Mlynarczyk, R. W. (2010). *Basic writing*. Parlor Press; The WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/referenceguides/basicwriting/

Perryman-Clark, S. & Craig, C. (2019). *Black perspectives in writing program administration: From the margins to the center*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Poe, M., Inoue, A. B., & Elliot, N. (Eds.). (2018). *Writing assessment social justice, and the advancement of opportunity*. The WAC Clearinghouse, University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/per-b.2018.0155

Ratcliffe, K. (2005). *Rhetorical listening: Identification, gender, Whiteness*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Reisch, M. (2014). *The Routledge international handbook of social justice*. Routledge.

Rickert, T. (2013). *Ambient rhetoric: The attunement of rhetorical being*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Rivers, N. A. (2016). Paying attention with cache. *Enculturation*, *23*. http://enculturation.net/paying-attention

Rhodes, J., & Alexander, J. (2014). Reimagining the social turn: New work from the field. *College English*, *76*(6), 481-487.

Ruiz, I. D. (2016). *Reclaiming composition for Chicano/as and other ethnic minorities: A critical history and pedagogy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge University Press.