

SECTION 2.

INTRA-CAMPUS AND INSTITUTIONAL NETWORKS: EXISTING AS A PROGRAM

Basic Writing

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

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

First-Year Writing

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

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

Writing Across the Curriculum

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

Writing Center

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

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

The second section of the collection narrows in its application to how specific designations and educational delivery systems influence the affordances and structures of academic pathways that rest alongside conceptions of “traditional” undergraduate students and the administrators who work in these arenas. The subsections locate the chapters by area: basic writing, first-year composition, writing across curriculum, and writing center.

Beginning with basic writing, John Tassoni’s chapter provides a critique of the “academic ableism” most often used as a heuristic to assign and ascribe

narratives of “basic” at institutions. As he traverses the histories, practices, and beliefs of various institutional agencies, Tassoni makes the case for people, programs, and offices across campuses to recognize their stake in basic writing programs as being influenced by larger systems and networks.

Next, we turn our attention to Lynn Reid, who outlines historical naming and funding opportunities linked to “basic” writing. Reid conducts a situational analysis of the conception of “remediation” to provide a method for data visualization that “makes the perspectives of human and non-human actors visible.” In her chapter, Reid argues the visualization of human and non-human actors provides readers with a more holistic picture regarding the rise and fall of “basic writing” as it is structured, unstructured, and re-structured in alignment with external mandates that supersede on-the-ground knowledges.

In Chapters 7 and 8, authors address systemic concerns in first-year writing. Drawing upon anecdotal and empirical data, Mara Lee Grayson examines how intersecting networks on the campus served, simultaneously and paradoxically, as barriers to and opportunities for equitable program redesign, and offers a conceptual framework through which WPAs in other institutions can honor disciplinary expertise and remain student-responsive in the face of administrative mandates. In Chapter 8, Emily Rónay Johnston questions how first-year writing programs function within the converging systems of institutional bureaucracies, academic elitism, and the capitalist structure of higher education, and capitulate to creating a hegemonic middle class.

Next, within the area of writing across the curriculum, Kelly Bradbury, Sue Doe, and Mike Palmquist discuss the Pathways Writing Integration Program at Colorado State University within the framework of activity theory to provide insights into the many system and network forces at play in working to establish a writing across the curriculum program. The authors use activity theory to explicate how the larger networks of the institution inform, shape, and challenge the implementation and continuation of a WAC program.

Finally, in Chapters 10 and 11, we consider the writing center, which often functions interstitially. Writing centers in rhetoric and composition administrative work often function as spaces between places, where human and non-human actors converge to work alongside larger narratives of written production in university settings. In Chapter 10, Eric C. Camarillo examines the efficacy of understanding the writing center as “border processing station” through the lens of activity theory, arguing that in order to understand abilities and affordances within the systems in which writing centers are placed, we must spend time focusing on what *actually* happens, not necessarily what *should* be happening. In Chapter 11, Lucien Darjeun Meadows discusses identity disclosure in the writing center and the complexity of personal narrative when placed in larger

academic systems, positing that greater attention to how the self exists within the system creates opportunity for change.

The aim of this section is to allow readers to select the campus entity within which they rest, and after selecting the area, to follow the authors, as you might a root system, noting how systems theory/analysis aided their growth in both insight and ability to maneuver existing problematic networks in their pursuit of change making and DEIBSJ. As we close this interchapter, we offer you a few reflection and discussion questions should you want to journal about your reading or use the book for a faculty book club or professional development. In particular, we encourage you to think about what you might take away or try from this section:

- Where do the rhetorics of basic, ableism, and remediation show up in documents, in meetings, in curriculum, in values, and in resources? Is there a reframing of language, ideology, and value that needs to happen?
- Where might the values of equitable program redesign ripple out to positively shape anti-racist program assessment and curriculum design, equitable hiring and promotion processes, mutuality within the rhetoric and composition classroom, and other DEIBSJ work?
- How might activity theory help you unpack the spheres of influence that shape program design, course design, hiring practices, community outreach, etc.?
- Who are the human actors and non-human actors that create positive and problematic processes? How might you examine human actors and non-human actors to examine what actually happens and not necessarily what should be happening?