

2021

Chapter 1

Engaged Inclusivity: What *Learning Enhanced* is all about

Roberta D. Kjesrud, *Western Washington University*



About the Author

Roberta was a peer tutor, a staff supervisor, and a director at Western Washington University's Writing Center between 1988-2015. In 2015, she became the Director of Writing for Western Libraries' Hacherl Research & Writing Studio. The editors welcome communication about this piece through the Studio's email: rws@wwu.edu.

RECOMMENDED CITATION, APA 7TH ED

Kjesrud, R. D. (2021). Engaged inclusivity: What *Learning Enhanced* is all about. In R. D. Kjesrud, P. Hemsley, S. Jensen, & E. Winningham (Eds.), *Learning enhanced: Studio practices for engaged inclusivity* (pp. 1.1 – 1.30). Western Libraries CEDAR. https://cedar.wwu.edu/learning_enhanced/22

This book is brought to you for free and open access by the Books and Monographs at Western CEDAR. It was accepted for inclusion in *Learning Enhanced: Studio Practices for Engaged Inclusivity* by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

Abstract

Chapter 1 opens with a brief glimpse of Studio life because Western Washington University's Hacherl Research & Writing Studio has been the testing grounds for the pedagogical innovations we suggest in this volume. While these innovations were initially motivated by increasing learning, we also noticed that they offered promising equity-based practices for forwarding engaged inclusivity. We explain our rationale for the approaches suggested by our core chapters on studio-based learning, integrated literacies, space and place, assessment, and the larger context of higher education. We also explain why we wrote the volume and why we made the publishing choices we did. The readers' guide explains how chapters follow a pattern of presenting disciplinary and cross-disciplinary theory, identifying pedagogical and equity gaps, and suggesting principles for application. Interchapters, on the other hand, are authored by practitioners who offer a more boots-on-the-ground approach to translating philosophy and principle into practice. To set up the rest of the volume, we offer definitions of several key terms used throughout, and we provide chapter and interchapter summaries to guide readers who may choose a non-linear approach to reading.

Keywords: Signature pedagogies, studio-based learning, integrated academic literacies, improving learning, engaged inclusivity, equity practices

In the fall of 2015, Western Washington University’s Writing Center and Western Libraries’ Research Consultation Services merged to form the Hacherl Research & Writing Studio. Located on the main floor of Western Libraries, the Studio caught on with students quickly; we typically enjoy more than 70,000 in-person visits a year¹. About two-thirds of the visitors² work alone, another third work in groups, and about 15% consult with our staff. It’s a busy place—at any given hour, 38 visitors are studying with us, although some don’t initially know they’re in the Studio. Because we’re boundary-less (no walls, no doors, no barriers), many *accidental tourists*³ stop by just because they’re attracted to our many affordances, including a choice of configurable furniture and of purpose-based zones: living room, collaborative area, focus area (includes semi-private pods and small rooms), and the classroom. Accidental or intentional, visitors choose a spot when they enter, and as they settle, a staff member comes to greet them, to explain how the space/consulting works, and to leave them a table tent with the option of summoning a staff member. Visitors usually stay, sometimes for hours. Staff periodically check on them, leaving them be when they are learning successfully on their own and offering coaching when they are stuck. Our average *micro-consultation*⁴ lasts around 13 minutes, although we’re likely to revisit multiple times as needed; in other words, we practice the just-in-time, serial micro-consulting consistent with studio-based learning. While we consult about most anything learning oriented, we’re most intentional about coaching research, reading, and writing,

¹ Note that the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic (March 2020-present) suspended face-to-face instruction. Unless noted, statistics, descriptions, and assessments all reflect pre-pandemic operations.

² Most, but not all, visitors are students.

³ *Accidental tourists* is our term for visitors who are initially unaware they are in the Studio.

⁴ *Micro-consulting* is our term for sequenced, short sessions focused on scaffolding a strategy to match a visitor’s incremental goal. On average, visits comprise 2-3 micro-consultations, each focused on emerging mini goals.

three highly interconnected academic literacies⁵. It is these two *signature pedagogies*⁶—studio-based learning and integrated literacies—that visitors find most distinctive about our Studio.

In developing the Hacherl Studio’s signature pedagogies, we found little guidance in our *home disciplines*⁷. For instance, although libraries have led parallel initiatives like information or learning commons and offer much scholarship on space design, library scholars largely omit studio pedagogy in teaching information literacy. Writing studies and writing center scholars write more of pedagogical matters, but the few pieces on studio pedagogy too often use space as a surrogate for pedagogy, a conflation that leads to the omission of explicitly articulated studio-based learning (SBL) principles and practices. Overall, in library information studies (LIS), writing studies (WS), and writing center studies (WCS), studio pedagogies and practices receive scant attention, and when they are mentioned, discussions are space-focused and lore-based, unsupported by replicable, aggregable, and data-supported (RAD)⁸ research linking pedagogical practices with learning—or with equity.

Happily, our home disciplines do a much better job of presenting the theoretical underpinnings of integrated academic literacies, although they stop short of presenting an overarching approach or connecting that approach with engaged inclusivity. LIS and WCS both pursue threads connecting writing and research; WCS and WS pursue

⁵ In fall 2020, we added speaking and listening to the Studio’s literacy ecosystem.

⁶ A *signature pedagogy* represents a fundamental style of teaching in a discipline, profession, or area of study (Shulman, 2005).

⁷ We refer to library information studies (LIS), writing studies (WS), and writing center studies (WCS) as our *home disciplines* throughout this volume.

⁸ See Richard Haswell’s (2005) call for more RAD research in composition studies, for example.

threads connecting writing and reading. But even with numerous well-articulated rationales for abandoning silos in favor of a merged support approach, our home disciplines present little beyond how-we-do-it-here, ad hoc collaborations that stop well short of articulating principles and practices for integration. In short, given our home disciplines' unfamiliarity with cross-disciplinary pedagogies, contentment with lore-based practices, bias toward space, and entrenched silos, practices in our home disciplines remain highly traditional, white-normed, and fossilized⁹. And yet, in planning the Hacherl Studio, we were convinced students needed us to innovate for the sake of increasing learning and engaged inclusivity. Others heard of our innovations, and to date, some 15-20 institutions have consulted our model. When visiting librarians and writing center professionals asked us to point them to supporting literature, we could only haw and hem. To fill that gap, we now offer this volume as one place to start.

What's *Engaged Inclusivity* and Why does it Matter?

As a privileged white educator, I am super nervous to write about engaged inclusivity. Little in my upbringing, my schooling, or, sadly, most of my professional development furthers my cultural competence. Worse, my professional evaluations over a 30-some year career have never required accountability for growth as an equity practitioner. That's why I've ended up as a 60-something educator on the eve of retirement finally owning my own whiteness¹⁰. I have spent too many years ignoring race, and I'm not qualified to address it.

As an anthropologist, I understand the value of both emic (insider) and etic (outsider) perspectives on culture, and I understand the power of exposing bias. As a student, I wrote an ethnography of a bingo hall,

⁹ For a summary of my writing-centered discontents, see [Interchapter 1A: A Critique of Pure Writing Center](#).

¹⁰ Whereas whiteness is a skin color, race scholar Dr. Frances Condon defines *whiteness* as a racialized epistemology or way of being in the world (as cited in D.-J. Kim & Olson, 2013, p. 1).

discovering along the way that I really loathe bingo. My professors assured me my perspective was valid, that disclosing my bias allowed readers to triangulate with other perspectives, including some from bingo appreciators. Although I won't speak for all authors, be aware that all my writings carry a whitely bias. I am racially naïve, I have benefitted from white privilege, and I have perpetuated racist systems. It's more than cheeky for me to talk about engaged inclusivity and equity practice from this position of privilege.

But too many with whitely identities have kept our mouths shut about appalling injustices. Equity practices take all of us. That's why I am emboldened by the invitation from three gracious and collaborative scholars, Brown McNair, Bensimon, and Malcom-Piqueux, to claim agency as a "first-generation equity practitioner" (personal communication from Gray to Bensimon, as cited in Brown McNair et al., 2020, p. 107). Rather than mocking my fumbling equity attempts, they generously invite me and other novices to join them in becoming equity practitioners. And so, I will speak both humbly and bravely, humbly cautioning readers to enlist whiteness mitigation strategies as they read, and bravely calling out the white supremacy themes in our home disciplines and pedagogical practices.

—Reflections from Roberta, a novice equity practitioner

It is with trepidation that I address the bold claim we've embedded in our title, that is, that studio practices foster *engaged inclusivity* by remediating white-normed, hegemonic educational practices. Before I forward the claim, I need to first engage the terminology. When Professor James Gray coined the term "first-generation equity practitioner" (as cited in Brown McNair et al., 2020, p. 107), Gray borrowed the first-generation metaphor in referring to practitioners like me who are new to equity-based practices. In the same way first-gen college students often lack cultural capital to

navigate the academy, first-gen equity practitioners similarly lack grounding in cultural competence. I cannot call on my education, experience, or enculturation to help me understand how whiteness shapes my educational philosophies and pedagogical practices, because “[p]ractitioners in higher education are mostly white and have not been given the opportunity to become educated or trained to be agents of racial equity” (Brown McNair et al., 2020, p. 108). As a new equity practitioner, I am actively remediating these gaps, but my process is flawed, and slow, and effortful—and regrettably without accountability¹¹. As Brown McNair et al. note, “We have observed that even among practitioners and leaders genuinely interested in achieving equity, they do and say things that are characteristic of ‘equity novices’” (2020, p. 108). Despite my stumbling efforts, Brown McNair, Bensimon, and Malcom-Piqueux extend novices like me an invitation, saying “[o]ur conception of first-generation equity practitioners represents a quest for a solution to racial inequity that empowers professionals to remake their practices” (2020, p. 117). It’s this invitation to remake practices that I gladly accept in exploring ways to move academic support programs away from oppressive and white supremacist practices toward equity-minded ones.

Novice status established, I rely on Brown McNair et al. for culturally competent terminology. *Inclusive success* or *inclusive excellence* have become buzzwords in higher education institutions (HEIs), most of whom now articulate goals around inclusion. The Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) acknowledges the equity agenda while urging HEIs to move from an “equity talk to an equity walk” in building

¹¹ Note how the first-gen metaphor breaks down: I have the option to avoid remediating white privilege without sanction whereas first-gen students must ameliorate knowledge/skills gaps or they will not succeed.

equity-minded campus culture (Brown McNair et al., 2020). On behalf of the AAC&U and the Center for Urban Education, Brown McNair, Bensimon, and Malcom-Piqueux critique *inclusion* as hegemonic in that it centers privileged academics who virtuously extend an invitation to those from identities who became marginal only because we first excluded them. Summarizing Dr. Gail Christopher, associated with AAC&U's Truth, Racial Healing and Transformation Centers, Brown McNair et al. call for reflectively examining the *inclusive excellence* terminology as

a representation of privilege and hierarchy because it implies that there is a group who (i) has the power to control access to excellence by deciding who is included, (ii) has ownership of what defines excellence, and (iii) requires that others must be invited to be part of this group in order to achieve excellence (2020, p. 5).

Instead, both AAC&U and Brown McNair et al. propose using the term *engaged inclusivity* to indicate shared ownership and agency around creating equity, thereby “transform[ing] the dialogue on inclusion from general acceptance and tolerance of difference to active institutional transformation, based on the belief that the richness of our culture is because of our diversity and a recognition of our common humanity” (AAC&U, 2019; Brown McNair et al., 2020). We use *engaged inclusivity* throughout this volume to signal an intentional shift away from the privileged extending inclusion magnanimously to minoritized voices and toward a perspective of collegiality in co-creating engaged inclusivity structures and practices.

Although most practitioners hold inclusive ideals, academic support programs were established as mechanisms of inclusion built on the premise that our expertise would create pathways to include the underserved in academic success. Writing centers,

libraries, and indeed many academic support units are no strangers to privilege, and the fact that most aren't as invitational across identities as they claim is well-investigated by scholars in our home disciplines. Yet there is evidence to suggest that students who most need these pathways aren't necessarily benefitting from our traditional pedagogies, most of which resonate with students who already have those resources. Empirical research notes that writing centers draw students from underserved populations, even though our literature encourages us to reject an identity of remediation. For instance, noting that retaining our institutional privilege relies on denying a remedial mission, Temple University's Lori Salem (2016) confirms in her research that the underserved attend but bemoans in a *Chronicle of Higher Education* interview that writing centers

have not built a pedagogy that actually serves [the underserved]. We should be a laboratory for understanding the kinds of pedagogies that would work for these students. Instead we're busily denying that they're there, and then applying pedagogies that work really well for privileged students. That's not helpful (Jacobs, 2018).

There is plenty of evidence indicating that writing centers perpetuate fault lines around minoritized identities, including race (Condon & Young, 2017; Diab et al., 2013; García, 2017; Green, 2016; Green & Condon, 2020; Grimm, 2011; Haltiwanger Morrison & Nanton, 2019), sexual orientation (Denny, 2010a, 2010b; Simpkins, n.d.), language identity (Burrows, 2016; Green, 2016; Greenfield, 2011), and socioeconomic class (Denny et al., 2018; Salem, 2016). Salem (2016), for instance, deconstructs students' so-called free choice to use writing centers, asserting that students are enculturated to visit or avoid writing centers based on pre-admission socio-cultural factors, and Denny,

Nordlof, and Salem (2018) offer empirical evidence that traditional writing center pedagogies fall short, at least for working-class students. Much, too, has been said about the regulatory role of writing centers in enforcing academic standards around language imperialism (Greenfield, 2011; Grimm, 2011), even as descriptive linguists document many varieties of world Englishes and asserts no moral advantage to any variety or dialect (Porto, 2020). Most alarming are the reasoned assertions that racism and surrogates such as language correctness provide the *raison d'être* of writing centers (Grimm, 2011; Lockett, 2019). If the distasteful notion of *helping* doesn't immediately communicate perpetuating a system of advantage at least partly based on race (Grimm, 2011), then at least we should acknowledge our standard pedagogies strongly map to values of [white supremacy culture](#), including perfectionism, individualism, productivity, and paternalism (Jones & Okun, 2001). For instance, traditional pedagogies like the perfectionistic "making better writers" (North, 1984), the individualistic "tutoring one-to-one" (Harris, 1986), and the productively paternalistic "minimalist tutoring" (Brooks, 1991) are all white-normed, whereas anti-racist, anti-colonial pedagogies like rhetorically negotiating world Englishes and multiple dialects, critiquing notions of correctness, learning in community, and practicing challenge to micro-aggressions are still rare in WCS scholarship (Grimm, 2011). In sum, despite consistent appeals for redressing them, racist and imperialist pedagogies persist in writing centers.

Libraries, too, are beginning to recognize the hegemony built into librarianship, both in the discipline and its practices. According to April Hathcock (2015), "[w]hiteness has permeated every aspect of librarianship, extending even to the initiatives we commit to increasing diversity." Despite efforts to diversify, recent demographic data released by

the American Library Association suggests that 86.7% of librarians identify as white, no significant improvement over 2014 data (ALA Office of Research and Statistics et al., 2017). Critical librarianship through critlib.org has been established for some ten years, but BIPOC librarian Jennifer Ferretti (2020) suggests that the movement has been largely performative, given what Bourg (2014) calls the “unbearable whiteness of librarianship.” In the words of librarian Eino Sierpe, “[T]he library profession has been remarkably successful in nurturing an unassailable public image of virtuous liberal benevolence and near mythical devotion to the highest ideals of freedom, individual rights, and democracy,” an unearned reputation that comes “[d]espite strong and persistent links to white supremacy and a well-established record excluding minorities from its ranks” (2019, p. 1). These are tough words. If there’s an increasing acknowledgement of structural racism embedded in libraries, LIS scholars have been slower to acknowledge oppressive pedagogies. Even more than writing center practitioners (often peers), librarians (often faculty) operate from behind imposing help desks from a service model that may not actually teach students the kinds of search strategies professionals use to locate scholarship most often written in correct academic language by and for other white scholars of privilege.

Considered in this volume as one of our home disciplines, writing studio scholarship has begun to explore the power of studio practices to create institutional change (Chandler & Sutton, 2018). Since studio pedagogy emerged in the composition classroom in response to the defunding of developmental English courses populated almost exclusively by minoritized students, practitioners adopted this pedagogy for the express purpose of democratizing access to literacy and literacy processes (Grego &

Thompson, 2008). Writing studios counter white supremacy practices in several ways. Studio pedagogy avoids individualism; instead, it features learning in community. Stable communities of students across identities gather regularly to support growth not just in literacy processes but also in academic success. Although teachers drop in and out of these groups as informants, instructors are familiar with the curriculum but deliberately lack grading authority over the groups they facilitate. Students also set the agenda in these conversations, meaning that they are less “scripted” than instructor-student or tutor-student dialogues, and students are authorized to propose “counterscripts” (Chandler & Sutton, 2018, pp. 12–13). Studio pedagogy also avoids perfectionism by normalizing recursive practice, and it minimizes paternalism by authorizing students to reject practices that aren’t working and select those that are. These equity practices may be small, but they have large consequences for both students and institutions. Despite the fact that “writing studios have been created to solve institutional problems, usually on short notice and with limited funding” (Chandler & Sutton, 2018, p. 16), WS scholars recently published a volume of admittedly mostly hero stories around the power of studios to drive institutional and structural change. It’s a start.

But change has been far too slow in coming. Now 30 years invested in the academy, I am continually dismayed by how little the institution has moved along the continuum of equity. Although there is more collective good will around embracing equity as a goal, we are still falling short in developing practices that make the goal a reality. Many factors likely contribute to this overall failure. Some lack will: privilege is indeed comfortable and enjoyable. Some lack knowledge: equity practices still lack

evidence-based empirical research. Some lack agency: what can a white first-gen equity practitioner say to the matter? Some lack know-how: how does one even begin unraveling a problem generations in the making? I confess to lacking all: will, knowledge, agency, and know-how. Yet to move from an equity talk to an equity walk takes all of us, and I'm encouraged by mentors like Brown McNair et al. (2020) that first-gen equity practitioners like me can be accomplices in creating equity. But before you start thinking we developed the Studio intentionally because we desired to undo hegemony, let me confess it was mostly the other way around. Innovating and observing students' responses to our innovations prompted equity-minded hindsight about just how oppressive our previous practices were. It's only in contrasting visitors' behavioral differences past and present that we truly understand the degree to which our traditional pedagogies were inclusive to those who already enjoyed privilege. These gradual realizations have created a gathering snowball of intentionality around engaging our learning community in equity practices.

Throughout this volume, we focus on do-able acts toward larger change goals, in this case, toward practices that promote engaged inclusivity. We've done this by decentering institutional structure, traditional silos, and lore-based practices that may never have served students well. Our do-able acts include two new signature pedagogies, an inquiry-and-improvement approach to assessment, and the willingness to consolidate programs to increase learning and reduce costs to students. Let me break it down. In Chapter 2 on studio-based learning, we see how SBL authorizes and equips students to self-regulate their learning rather than rely on non-directive questioning (WCS) or telling (LIS), neither of which scaffolded, well, much of any learning. In

Chapter 3 on integrated literacies, we see how a literacy ecology authorizes students to join the scholarly conversation and creates more transparent and seamless access to literacy growth. By treating literacies like the snarly mess they are, we avoid making students figure out what to call the problem before they decide which service desk to consult. In Chapter 4 on space and place, we show how combining cultural competence with invitational education can create a learning community, one that is not just home to staff but one that centers belonging across identities. As members of that community, staff listen to what students across identities need, respond in ways they deem helpful, recognize them as experts in the student experience, and authorize them to teach and learn with us. In Chapter 5 on assessment, we decenter evaluating to prove we're good in favor of identifying where we can be better by welcoming traditionally excluded voices as co-inquirers rather than as objects of assessment. In Chapter 6 on sociopolitical context of higher education, we argue that even the most uncomfortable of programmatic consolidations should be seen as equity opportunities to increase learning while doing our part to keep the cost of education as accessible as possible to as many identity groups as possible. Taken together, this volume unapologetically urges a qualitative departure from the status quo, offering concrete, do-able acts toward engaged inclusivity as an aspired destination. Acknowledging retrospectively that our traditional pedagogies reify race, class, and other power differentials, we push forward with new equity practices that, while imperfect and fledgling, at least move the needle toward the kind of engaged inclusivity we hope for.

Volume Overview

The volume features two types of writing in chapters and interchapters. Traditional chapters offer a tour of LIS, WS, and WCS literature along with cross-disciplinary literature to understand the philosophy and theory underlying each chapter's theme. Chapters culminate with implementation principles that can be universally applied or adapted across institutional contexts. What readers won't find much of in these chapters are practices specific to the Hacherl Studio. Since abstract principles may not satisfy readers' curiosities about how those principles can be applied, we illuminate some of our most promising practices in interchapters. Interchapters typically begin with a representative example of a particular learning issue, a pattern of staff-visitor exchanges, or an unresolved administrative dilemma; practitioners then demonstrate how they address the challenge using studio philosophy. Where chapters provide theoretical rationale, interchapters provide practitioner expertise on translating theory into lived experience. In other words, practitioners keep it real. We hope by balancing philosophy, theoretical principles, and pedagogical practices, readers will understand how our innovations can enhance equity-based learning and will envision how to implement some of these practices in their own programs, studio or otherwise.

Thematic Overview

Foundations: Chapter 1, Interchapters 1A and 1B

In [Chapter 1, "Engaged Inclusivity: What *Learning Enhanced* is all about,"](#) I explain the vision for equity-based pedagogies and outline the ways our home disciplines remain white-normed and oppressive in our institutional structures, theoretical approaches, and daily practices. Since implementing the innovations we outline in this volume, we more clearly see the extent to which our prior approaches

poorly served our institutions, our programs, and our learners across identities. In addition to defining many of our terms, Chapter 1 also provides this overview of the entire content, which we hope will act as a touchstone against the potential confusion of reading non-linearly. If ever you get lost in the weeds, we invite you back to this chapter for wayfinding. In [Interchapter 1A, “A Critique of Pure Writing Center,”](#) I reflect on how my disgruntlement with orthodox, lore-based writing center practices created enough dissonance to spur sweeping changes to thinking I’d held for decades. (I’m more grunted now, thank you!) So that readers can trace cause and effect, if you will, I also tie my dissonance to some of the Hacherl Studio’s corresponding innovations. In [Interchapter 1B, “Reading Backwards,”](#) Wyatt Heimbichner Goebel, our biologist-poet alumnus, offers a preview for Chapter 2 through one of the most compelling poems I’ve ever read about studio-based micro-consulting. Okay, it’s the only poem I’ve ever read on this topic, but you’ll see just how well it captures the ethos of studio-based learning.

Studio-based Learning: Chapter 2, Interchapters 2A, 2B, and 2C

[Chapter 2, “Studio-based Learning Pedagogy and Practices,”](#) explains the Hacherl Studio’s first signature pedagogy, and it outlines the principles that guide our corresponding practices, including micro-consulting. This chapter traces the conceptual history of studio-based learning (SBL) (Hetland et al., 2013; Schön, 1985) in educational theories such as problem-based learning (Barrows, 1986), scaffolding (Nordlof, 2014), and transfer of learning (Haskell, 2001). We also show how these theories connect with the kind of learning studios support: learning *about*, learning *how*, and learning *to become* (Crowther, 2013, p. 20). In the companion interchapters, practitioners unpack three practices we find essential to successfully implementing SBL: leaving, strategies,

and agency. In his prescient piece [Interchapter 2A, “The Art of Leaving.”](#) Eric Bachmeier offers a time-tested practice he developed some 20 years ago but that we only fully adopted in the Studio some 15 years later. Writing at a time when our writing center assistants felt obliged to sit with visitors for 50-minute appointments, Eric urged (horrors!) benevolent abandonment. For those wondering what visitors do while we’re ignoring them, read [Interchapter 2B, “Channeling Dr. Frankenstein: Personalizing Strategies.”](#) Leah Robinson offers an approach to tailoring process strategies based on visitors’ individual strengths and goals. Her work illuminates SBL’s emphasis on active learning, on scaffolding process-based strategies, and on creating opportunities for agency and metacognition. And finally in [Interchapter 2C, “The ‘No Stakes Agenda’: A Unique Approach to Equity.”](#) Rachel Myers, student-coordinator-turned-alumna, suggests an agenda-setting practice that grants visitors agency and works to ensure we avoid sending not-your-place messages to visitors of all identities.

Academic Literacies: Chapter 3, Interchapter 3A

In [Chapter 3, “Academic Literacies as Ecology.”](#) we argue that viewing academic literacies as a single ecology is a conceptual threshold¹² that contentedly siloed library, writing, and writing center professionals need to apprehend. This chapter provides a rationale for re-integrating research, reading, and writing, literacies that neuroscientists and literacy scholars (see for example Baer, 2016; D’Angelo et al., 2016; McClure, 2016) tell us should never have been separated in the first place. This chapter also presents principled advice for ways currently siloed professionals can leverage incremental, doable acts in making change, in accessing institutional resources, and in increasing

¹² *Threshold concepts* are conceptual gateways to new ways of thinking about a domain (Meyer & Land, 2003).

campus understandings of holistic literacy learning. In [Interchapter 3A, “Modeling Ecology.”](#) poet Wyatt Heimbichner Goebel returns with a biology-informed poem that helps us visualize an ecology of literacies.

Placemaking: Chapter 4, Interchapters 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4D

[Chapter 4, “Placemaking through Learner-based Design,”](#) explains the spatial contexts that facilitate learner-based pedagogies. Although space is not pedagogically deterministic, there is increasing evidence that *built environments*¹³ (Monahan, 2002) send implicit rhetorical messages about the pedagogies and behaviors institutions value. This chapter¹⁴ not only engages the philosophy of *space* (Harvey, 2006; Lefebvre, 1991), *place* (Comber, 2016; Council on Library and Information Resources, 2005; Freeman, 2005), *thirdspace* (Soja, 1996), and *non-place* (Augé, 1995), it also engages how the byproducts of colonialism embedded in built space send dangerously harmful messages of no-place-for-you-and-your-kind (García, 2017). In the principles section, we suggest ways that *invitational education* (Purkey & Novak, 2015) practices can be augmented to create a method for learner-based anti-colonial design. In [Interchapter 4A, “Make Space.”](#) Wyatt Heimbichner Goebel returns in poetry formatted to represent the Hacherl Studio space. In [Interchapter 4B, “Welcome to Your Place: The Inclusive Power of Greetings.”](#) former student coordinator and new alumna Kellyn Wolden demonstrates the pedagogy of greetings, showing their power to invite and engage our visitors in co-ownership and in co-creating inclusivity. In [Interchapter 4C, “From Black Hole to Mission Control: Study Space Exploration,”](#) current student coordinator Evangeline

¹³ The *built environment* or *built space* refers to the collective man-made structures, features, and facilities in which people live and work (see for example Monahan, 2002).

¹⁴ Because there are so many spatial terms to define, we refer readers directly to [Chapter 4](#).

Schmitt proposes ways of increasing students' agency over their study environments, both physical and virtual. Finally, Pippa Hemsley, the Studio's recent Assistant Director, challenges one-dimensional online approaches with an antidote that's visionary in education but commonplace in the virtual world. In [Interchapter 4D, "Unconstrained by Space and Time: Creating a Choice-Rich Virtual Studio,"](#) Hemsley's embedded videos demonstrate existing tools for active learning, and her text proposes a process for choosing and implementing those tools to create learner-based virtual places pedagogically congruent with physical ones.

Assessment: Chapter 5, Interchapter 5A

[Chapter 5, "Using Assessment to Prompt Innovation,"](#) begins by distinguishing *evaluation* from *assessment*¹⁵ and overviews the larger higher education institution (HEI) assessment landscape. Arguing that both HEIs and academic support programs attend disproportionately to proof of value, I further argue we are missing the opportunity to stay curious about how to improve equity-based teaching and learning by counter-balancing the proof agenda with an *improve* agenda. To model our own improvement efforts, we show how inquiry-based assessment helped the Hacherl Studio understand more about what visitors learned, what practices prompted that learning, what learning opportunities our staff missed, and how we innovated in response. In typical fashion, the chapter closes with assessment principles to guide professionals in recursively building an incremental assessment portfolio. In [Interchapter 5A, "Holding Space in Consultations,"](#) student-coordinator-turned-alumna Ally Duvall uses her

¹⁵ In this volume, *evaluation* indicates a summative proof of value whereas *assessment* identifies evidence of learning, gaps in learning, and improvements to address the gaps.

psychology expertise to show how practitioners can pursue different learning outcomes through one method: *holding space*¹⁶. Using her choose-your-own-adventure format, practitioners can manipulate the same scenario in pursuit of different outcomes.

Informative, and good fun!

Value: Chapter 6, Interchapter 6A, Interchapter 6B

In [Chapter 6, “Value Added: Mergers to Increase Learning.”](#) I join forces with Sarah McDaniel, former Director of Teaching & Learning, to explain how the economic climate for HEIs affects academic support programs, arguing that unit-level collaborations are increasingly essential both for fiscal responsibility and for student success (Barr & McClellan, 2018; Blumenstyk, 2014; Salem, 2014). Although gloomy sociopolitical trends precede the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, we also address how the pandemic economy amplifies them. Because scholarship in our home disciplines seems biased toward resisting consolidations rather than pro-actively negotiating them, we suggest collaborative practices for anticipating and resolving structural conflict. In [Interchapter 6A, “Pandemacademia: Sustaining Programs in Times of Crisis.”](#) I discuss how post-pandemic economic inevitabilities (what I’m calling *pandemacademia*) render futile the zero-sum, defend-our-borders approach currently common among writing center professionals. I show that the autonomy I previously cherished poorly served both our program and students, and I explain how a merged identity conserved institutional resources¹⁷ while garnering more program security and improved student learning. In response to many questions from those investigating studios, I added a

¹⁶ *Holding space* means putting your needs and opinions aside in favor of allowing someone to just be (J. Kim, 2019).

¹⁷ In our case, the Studio’s innovative approach generated over \$500,000 in private donations.

practices-based [Interchapter 6B, “Just the FAQs: What Enquirers Ask about Studio Logistics.”](#) I’m hoping this chapter satisfies reader curiosity about logistical issues such as staff development, mixed-role staffing, online practices, and change leadership.

Advice for Readers

In keeping with our engaged inclusivity ethos, we decided to publish open access on Western Libraries’ digital repository [Western CEDAR](#). The format has many advantages for you as readers; you can choose your level of engagement with theory, you can choose topics of interest, or you can assign pieces for staff development—all for one low price: free. The format has some advantages on the publishing end as well; we can revise chapters as our thinking evolves, new practitioners can contribute as they have ideas, and we can work with beloved in-house colleagues instead of distant publishers. Of course, there are a few disadvantages, too. The easiest to overcome is the lack of a linear arc as readers dip in and out. We’ve made efforts to eliminate repetition while ensuring enough context for each piece to stand on its own¹⁸, and we have taken pains to define most of our terminology in this introduction as well as in each chapter. However, non-chronological readers may encounter concepts for which the context is elsewhere, and chronological readers may tire of redundancy. *Mea culpa*.

Readers may also want to know that we took an anti-imperialistic approach to The Rules. We basically adhere to the Standard American Academic English (SAAE) prescriptive conventions of grammar, punctuation, and APA and Word¹⁹ formatting. But we did not pursue perfection because we are uncomfortable with twin roots of language

¹⁸ It’s for this reason each chapter and interchapter carries discrete pagination.

¹⁹ I, Roberta, invested way too much time trying to fix the very large gaps at the end of some pages. When I fixed that problem, it created others. Forgive me.

imperialism and white supremacy culture (Jones & Okun, 2001). We take courage from the prestigiously published and oft-cited article by Joseph M. Williams (1981), who revealed in a surprise ending that he deliberately inserted about 100 errors, most of which went completely unnoticed by other composition scholars. Our errors are admittedly less intentional, but we resisted the urge to become “Ms. Fidditch and Mr. Flutesnoot armed with sharpened red pencils,” recognizing along with Connors and Lunsford (1988, p. 395) that compositionists have needlessly suffered the tension between affectively supporting student writers with one breath and rooting out all grammatical evil with the other. In research comparing the frequency of error in student papers from the 1930’s and from the 1980’s (spoiler: no change), they chronicle much historical angst over those 50 years; and it’s still with us today. We’re over it. We hope you are too.

We also took an anti-colonial approach to peer review. With no interest in the commodification of knowledge²⁰, we were not interested in pursuing an elusive seal of approval associated with blind review. Instead, we pursued a dialogic and relational approach to “answerability,” which Leigh Patel in *Decolonizing Academic Research* defines as “responsibilities as speakers, listeners, and those responsibilities include stewardship of ideas and learning, ownership” (2015, p. 74). Patel (2015, pp. 74–82) goes on to suggest that scholars and their work must be answerable to learning (transformative learning, not schooling), knowledge (knowledge about learning, not as commodity), and context (challenging oppressions, not reifying them). In pursuing our

²⁰ Because no author/editor is eligible, no scholarship in this volume counts toward tenure and promotion. Tenure track faculty whose proposals were accepted for inclusion ultimately chose to author for other publications with traditionally accepted metrics. The academy has a long way to go to “decolonize” research.

own standards of answerability, we solicited substantive feedback and dialogue on each chapter from knowledgeable colleagues who are unapologetically our friends. We feel fortunate to have had their generous input, and all reviewing scholars are acknowledged in the chapters they reviewed. But our answerability process continues because we are also accountable to you as readers. If you find that we have fallen short in our responsibility to learning, knowledge, and context, we invite ongoing dialogue. Please feel free to send us your thoughts using the [email contact](#) listed on each chapter's title page.

Acknowledgments/Answerability

Many thanks to co-editor Pippa Hemsley for her response to an earlier draft; though she also claims a whitely identity, she is a more seasoned equity practitioner who has greatly challenged my growth. I wanted to ask BIPOC colleagues for reader response, but I felt uncomfortable adding to their undue burden in anti-racism work. Instead, I invite readers across identities to participate voluntarily this chapter's answerability. Thank you.

References

- AAC&U. (2019, February 13). *2019 diversity, equity, and student success*. Association of American Colleges & Universities. <https://www.aacu.org/conferences/dess/2019>
- ALA Office of Research and Statistics, Rosa, K., & Henke, K. (2017). *2017 ALA demographic study*. American Library Association. [http://www.ala.org/tools/sites/ala.org.tools/files/content/Draft of Member Demographics Survey 2001-11-2017.pdf](http://www.ala.org/tools/sites/ala.org.tools/files/content/Draft%20of%20Member%20Demographics%20Survey%2001-11-2017.pdf)
- Augé, M. (1995). *Non-places: Introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*. Verso.
- Baer, A. (2016). *Information literacy and writing studies in conversation: Reenvisioning library-writing program connections*. Library Juice Press.
- Barrows, H. S. (1986). A taxonomy of problem-based learning methods. *Medical Education*, 20(6), 481–486. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.1986.tb01386.x>
- Bourg, C. (2014, March 4). The unbearable whiteness of librarianship. *Feral Librarian*. <https://chrisbourg.wordpress.com/2014/03/03/the-unbearable-whiteness-of-librarianship/>
- Brooks, J. (1991). Minimalist tutoring: Making the student do all the work. *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 15(6), 1–4.
- Brown McNair, T., Bensimon, E. M., & Malcom-Piqueux, L. (2020). *From equity talk to equity walk: Expanding practitioner knowledge for racial justice in higher education* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119428725>

- Burrows, C. (2016). Writing while Black: The Black tax on African American graduate writers. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 14(1), 15–20.
- Chandler, S., & Sutton, M. (2018). Writing studios and change. In M. Sutton & S. Chandler (Eds.), *The writing studio sampler: Stories about change* (pp. 3–26). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.
<https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/studio/chapter1.pdf>
- Comber, B. (2016). *Literacy, place, and pedagogies of possibility*. Routledge.
- Condon, F., & Young, V. A. (Eds.). (2017). *Performing antiracist pedagogy in rhetoric, writing, and communication*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/atd/antiracist/>
- Connors, R. J., & Lunsford, A. A. (1988). Frequency of formal errors in current college writing, or Ma and Pa Kettle do research. *College Composition and Communication*, 39(4), 395–409. <https://doi.org/10.2307/357695>
- Council on Library and Information Resources (Ed.). (2005). *Library as place: Rethinking roles, rethinking space*. Council on Library and Information Resources. <http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub129abst.html>
- Crowther, P. (2013). Understanding the signature pedagogy of the design studio and the opportunities for its technological enhancement. *Journal of Learning Design*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.5204/jld.v6i3.155>
- D'Angelo, B. J., Jamieson, S., Maid, B., & Walker, J. R. (Eds.). (2016). *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.
<https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/infolit/>

- Denny, H. C. (2010a). *Facing the center: Toward an identity politics of one-to-one mentoring*. Utah State University Press.
- Denny, H. C. (2010b). Queering the writing center. *The Writing Center Journal*, 30(1), 95–124.
- Denny, H. C., Nordlof, J., & Salem, L. (2018). “Tell me exactly what it was that I was doing that was so bad”: Understanding the needs and expectations of working-class students in writing centers. *The Writing Center Journal*, 37(1), 67–100.
- Diab, R., Ferrell, T., Godbee, B., & Simpkins, N. (2013). Making commitments to racial justice actionable. *Across the Disciplines*, 10(3).
<https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/race/diabetal.pdf>
- Ferretti, J. (2020). Building a Critical Culture: How Critical Librarianship Falls Short in the Workplace. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 14(1).
<https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2020.14.1.10>
- Freeman, G. T. (2005). The library as place: Changes in learning patterns, collections, technology, and use. In *Library as place: Rethinking roles, rethinking space* (pp. 1–9). Council on Library and Information Resources.
<http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub129abst.html>
- García, R. (2017). Unmaking Gringo-centers. *The Writing Center Journal*, 36(1), 29–60.
- Green, N.-A. S. (2016). The re-education of Neisha-Anne Green: A close look at the damaging effects of “a standard approach,” the benefits of code-meshing, and the role allies play in this work. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 14(1), 72–82.

- Green, N.-A. S., & Condon, F. (2020). Letters on moving from ally to accomplice: Anti-racism and the teaching of writing. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R. Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25* (pp. 277–292). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.0360.2.15>
- Greenfield, L. (2011). The “Standard English” fairy tale: A rhetorical analysis of racist pedagogies and commonplace assumptions about language diversity. In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing centers and the new racism: A call for sustainable dialogue and change* (pp. 33–60). Utah State University Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt4cgk6s.6
- Grimm, N. M. (2011). Rethorizing writing center work to transform a system of advantage based on race. In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing centers and the new racism: A call for sustainable dialogue and change* (pp. 75–100). Utah State University Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt4cgk6s.8
- Haltiwanger Morrison, T. M., & Nanton, T. O. (2019). Dear writing centers: Black women speaking silence into language and action. *The Peer Review*, 3(1). <https://thepeerreview-iwca.org/issues/redefining-welcome/dear-writing-centers-black-women-speaking-silence-into-language-and-action/>
- Harris, M. (1986). *Teaching one-to-one: The writing conference*. National Council of Teachers of English.

- Harvey, D. (2006). Space as a keyword. In N. Castree & D. Gregory (Eds.), *David Harvey: A critical reader* (pp. 70–93). Blackwell Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470773581.ch14>
- Haskell, R. E. (2001). *Transfer of learning: Cognition, instruction, and reasoning*. Academic Press.
- Haswell, R. H. (2005). NCTE/CCCC's recent war on scholarship. *Written Communication*, 22(2), 198–223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088305275367>
- Hathcock, A. (2015, October 7). White librarianship in blackface: Diversity initiatives in LIS. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*.
<http://inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/>
- Hetland, L., Winner, E., Veenema, S., & Sheridan, K. M. (2013). *Studio thinking 2: The real benefits of visual arts education* (2 Revised edition). Teachers College Press.
- Jacobs, R. (2018, February 5). What's wrong with writing centers. *Chronicle of Higher Education News*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/whats-wrong-with-writing-centers/>
- Jones, K., & Okun, T. (2001). White supremacy culture. In *Dismantling Racism: A Workbook for Social Change Groups*. Peace Development Fund.
http://www.csworkshop.org/PARC_site_B/dr-culture.html
- Kim, D.-J., & Olson, B. (2013). Deconstructing whiteness in the globalized classroom. *Across the Disciplines*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2016.0933.2.06>
- Kim, J. (2019, October 9). *What does it mean / look like to hold space for someone?* Medium. <https://angrytherapist.medium.com/what-does-it-mean-look-like-to-hold-space-for-someone-5feb78134caf>

- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Lockett, A. (2019). Why I call it the academic ghetto: A critical examination of race, place, and writing centers. *Praxis*, 16(2), 20–33.
- McClure, R. (2016). *Rewired: Research-writing partnerships in a frameworks state of mind*. Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2003). *Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines* (Occasional Report 4; Enhancing Teaching-Learning Environments in Undergraduate Education Courses, p. 14). Universities of Edinburgh.
<http://www.etl.tla.ed.ac.uk/docs/ETLreport4.pdf>
- Monahan, T. (2002). Flexible space & built pedagogy: Emerging IT embodiments. *Inventio*, 4(1), 1–19.
- Nordlof, J. (2014). Vygotsky, scaffolding, and the role of theory in writing center work. *The Writing Center Journal*, 34(1), 45–64.
- North, S. M. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English*, 46(5), 433–446.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/377047>
- Patel, L. (2015). Answerability. In *Decolonizing educational research* (pp. 71–83). Routledge. <http://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/answerability-leigh-patel/10.4324/9781315658551-5>
- Porto, M. (2020). Negotiating a diverse orientation to critical pedagogies: An interview with Suresh Canagarajah. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 0(0), 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2020.1788564>

- Purkey, W. W., & Novak, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to invitational theory*. International Alliance for Invitational Education.
<https://www.invitationaleducation.org/an-introduction-to-invitational-theory/>
- Salem, L. (2016). Decisions...decisions: Who chooses to use the writing center? *The Writing Center Journal*, 35(2), 147–171.
- Schön, D. A. (1985). *The design studio: An exploration of its traditions and potentials*. RIBA Publications for RIBA Building Industry Trust; Exclusive distributor, ISBS.
- Shulman, L. S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0011526054622015>
- Sierpe, E. (2019). Confronting librarianship and its function in the structure of white supremacy and the ethno state. *Journal of Radical Librarianship*, 5, 84–102.
- Simpkins, N. (n.d.). Meeting the needs of LGBTQ students in the writing center. *Another Word*. Retrieved January 26, 2018, from <https://writing.wisc.edu/blog/meeting-the-needs-of-lgbtq-students-in-the-writing-center/>
- Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Blackwell.
- Williams, J. M. (1981). The phenomenology of error. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(2), 152–168. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356689>