

## **Baltimore Writing Center Project 2021-2022**

Prep Plan for March 26

Part 1: [Reading/Watching/Listening Prep](#)

Part 2: [Prep Activity](#)

## Reading/Watching/Listening Prep:

**Note:** David, Elaine, and I added additional resources to the categories y'all explored for the last session. For example, in the section on decolonization, we've added a special journal issue with lots of great articles. We've also shifted the Caste readings to that category (PDFs attached to email from us)

**Note:** Written texts not linked in this document are are linked as PDFs in our WP site just beneath this document

Martinez (2020) *Counterstory*

- Browse through pages 1-9 to get a clearer picture of the context of counterstory, kinds of counterstory you can write, and some definitions (Do NOT read every word)
- Read pages 15-18 very carefully to refresh on how Critical Race Theory (CRT) informs the writing of counterstory + how critical narrative is a key method of writing counterstory (I've highlighted in blue where to start on page 15 and where to stop on page 18)
- Read page 23 very carefully, noting what Martinez says about who can write counterstory + how white counterstory/critical narrative differs from counterstory written by racialized and marginalized writers

Condon, Faison, and Green (2021) Writing center research and Critical Race Theory (CRT)

- Read pages 36-38 very carefully to learn more about how CRT and storytelling work in writing center contexts

Diab, Ferrel, & Godbee (2017) Making commitments to racial justice actionable

- Return to and browse pages 19-26 (we read this last semester) to learn about the challenges and pitfalls of writing critical narrative (I've highlighted in blue where to start on page 19 and where to stop on page 26; do NOT read every word)

Ryden (2021) [Moving whiteness: Rhetoric and political emotion](#) AND [Confessing whiteness](#)

- Read very carefully the annotated bibliographic entries I wrote to summarize and discuss the key arguments, concepts, and ideas in the chapters (Just click on the linked texts to get to the entries below)

Woods (2020) [Episode 28: Frankie Condon](#) AND [Episode 100: Ira Shor](#)

- *Optional:* listen as you can/wish to learn more about critical and critical race approaches to the teaching of writing and writing center work

**Ryden, Wendy. (2012). Moving whiteness: Rhetoric and political emotion. In Ryden and Marshall (Eds.), *Reading, Writing, and the Rhetorics of Whiteness* (pp. 117-135). Routledge.**

Ryden (2012) problematizes the ways education in the United States draws from theories and practices of critical pedagogy while also engaging in liberal multiculturalist discourses that emphasize rationality over affect in classroom discussions about race. In doing so, she argues, educators normalize developing and refining individual arguments rooted in Western notions of logic and reasoned “sides” (p. 119), while downplaying or avoiding “the nature of their emotional valences” (p. 119), a move that consequently dismisses embodied, visceral responses to racialization and racism. Ryden explains how these pedagogical choices dismiss the “emotional being [and] bodily integrity” (p. 118) that shape whiteness as a characteristic of identity embedded within racial formation and white supremacy culture. Whiteness in the classroom, in turn, becomes obscured and protected through inordinate attention to individualist merits of intellectualism and a sort of “emotional sovereignty” (p. 118) that relegates interrogation of whiteness to an irreproachable realm of the personal and private. Drawing on the work of fellow critical whiteness scholar Christine Sleeter (1993), Ryden maintains that this myopic focus on reason when addressing whiteness in the classroom inaccurately casts racism as an “illogical discourse” (p. 121), a characterization that ignores white people’s ongoing attempts to rationalize historical and contemporary colonialism and white hegemony while failing to critically address “the racism inherent in whiteness” (p. 121). She describes this deliberate “hegemonic technology of ‘ignorance’” (p. 121) as a discourse of whiteness through which white people, specifically educators, eschew the fact of the “affective dimension” (p. 121) as a public and collective “cultural discourse that is normative and that yields itself up to rhetorical analysis” (p. 121).

Studying and critiquing these discourses, according to Ryden, presents opportunities for students and their instructors to engage the politics of whiteness and emotion, critiquing how they combine to shape structures of white supremacy culture “embedded in the emotional responses of individuals performing as social agents” (pp. 124-125). These learning moments often critique not only the evidence and fallacies undergirding, for example, meritocracy, the expectation that whiteness go unremarked and normalized, and insistence on civility in discussions about whiteness, if it’s addressed at all, often result in displays of intense negative feelings associated with indignation, denial, foreclosure, and appeals to white innocence, as well as guilt and shame. Yet Ryden insists that these markers of whiteness are bound intricately and inextricably to both the racial project of white supremacy and to “feelings of entitlement and superiority that whiteness engenders” (p. 126)—all of which offer rich chances to map the multiple social scales across which these emotions cohere and reproduce white supremacy cultural norms and violence. Drawing from Koziak’s (2000) theory of political emotion and Nausbaum’s (1997) interpretation of Aristotle’s rhetorical linking of logos and pathos, Ryden traces how such intentional pedagogy in classrooms and curricula might develop in students “ethical” (p. 129) individual and collective habits of mind and practices capable of countering the Western liberal tendency to dismiss emotion and its direct influence on reason and, by extension, politics and race relations, especially white students’ engagement with their own

whiteness in public, not just private, discourses. She argues that this approach to teaching race enables students to become aware of the complex ways emotions move political participation in these public discourses on race. Understanding this process by naming and critiquing its reproductive emotion not only spotlights the “moral emotional dispositions” (p. 130) on which rational thought depends but also rematerializes for students and their instructors the body-politic of “recognition” (p. 131) in which they “achieve an ironic distance from their own lives, forever altering their ontological relationships” (p. 131).

As I grapple with this possibility in my own work and life, I also recognize that my research interviews may become sites of this engagement with political emotion and with the potential tendency of participants to default away from addressing emotion, favoring logos-centered epistemologies. How, or should, I craft questions and approaches for talking with white writing center administrators about our feelings in these moments? How can we, to draw on Leonardo’s (2009) words, push “through” instead of “around” the emotional-rational structuring of our positionalities and subjectivities in our conversations about writing center work and reach for the kind of “recognition” Ryden theorizes? Doing so would hurt and (re)ignite a perpetual shift in subjectivity where whiteness is unabashedly exposed and de-centered and we, ourselves, openly and emotionally interrogate our political power and control within our centers and institutions. Doing so might also open us to cycles of the “historical body” (Scallon & Scollon, 2004, p. 13) of our whiteness, eliciting emotional responses through which we can regard one another as “in it together” as we admit, at heart, we fear the grief and epistemological collapse that recognition brings. Yet at the same time, as Ryden emphasizes, we can also lean into this fear, thinking and feeling our way through belief as shaped by these emotions and posing whiteness as “a problem of emotional rhetoric” (p. 135). We can ask: “what [then] happens to the belief in whiteness?” (p. 135).

**Ryden, W. (2012). Confessing whiteness. In W. Ryden and I. Marshall (Eds.), *Reading, writing, and the rhetorics of whiteness*. Routledge (pp. 11-38).**

In line with contemporary cautions on the use of counterstory by white critical race theorists (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Leonardo, 2009; Condon, 2012; Matias, 2016; Alemán, 2017; Martínez 2020), Ryden (2012) examines white scholars' use of self-critical and confessional narrative as a methodology and method in research. As tools for transparency, accountability, and positionality, these approaches can serve to "unmask and unmake" (p. 14) whiteness but simultaneously serve as performative acts of antiracism whereby such narratives reify and recenter whiteness as the determining and authenticating factor of race-critical scholarship (Fields, 2001). This point complicates my work as a white researcher. An uncritical post-structural insistence on my white persona and identity as unstable would assume that my identity is salvageable from structural deterministic understandings of my complicity in racism and white supremacy, giving the illusion that through my self-reflexivity I somehow accomplish, or write my way into, liberation. While my writing of narrative might heighten my "representational control" (p. 18), I have to recognize that "personal narrative is (only ever) a controlled exploration of self and experience even when it purports to be an 'honest' one" (p. 18). My authenticity, and therefore my confession, is performative and this performativity inescapably shapes what and how my narratives mean in the context of my analysis of whiteness. I both repudiate and reclaim processes of white identification while always inevitably dramatizing and attempting to rehabilitate a supposedly "chastened, converted" (p. 21) and unitary self. As a white writing center administrator, I rescue myself in a sort of capitulation to structures and structurations of race and racism, "reconstituting the centrality of whiteness to the moral universe" (p. 23) of the writing center.

Given these realities, I have to question the extent to which narrative as a source of textual and discursive data for my project can serve as a racial "reckoning" (p. 24) and a nexus for personal and social structural change. However, I may not need solely to depend on the genre or mode of narrative. Ryden and Marshall, later in their text, suggest an alternative: "more dynamic, interactive forms [such as dialogue] that focus less on performing subjectivity and more on the 'to-ing and fro-ing' of sustained interaction between and among subjects" (p. 134). I might, therefore, opt to engage a "dialogic of knowing" (Smith, 1996, p. 194), exploring through methodologies of ethnography of communication, specifically critical discourse analysis, the ways "divergent perspectives" (p. 194) of and experiences with and through whiteness between myself and other white writing center administrators "are coordinated in the social act of referring [...] and knowledge" (p. 194). Investigating these dialogic encounters might allow me to map how whiteness "comes into being through language and through the sensory ground" (p. 194) that white writing center administrators share without presuming a post-structuralist understanding of white identity as fragmentary and therefore retrievable or, worse, capable of rehabilitation from structural and deterministic notions of discourse. Rather, this approach could offer a critique of such notions of discourse in line with Smith's (1996) conceptualization of knowledge and discourse as always local and "always among people in concerted sequences of action who know how to take up the instruction discourse provides, and to find, recognize, and affirm, or sometimes fail to find what discourse tells is there, as well as relying on just such

dialogic sequences to settle disputes about what is” (p. 193). My research, then, might recognize knowledge and truth-telling “not as functions of the individuated consciousness, but as dialogic sequences of action in which divergent consciousnesses are coordinated” (p. 193).

## Prep Activity

**Step 1:** Following up on our great conversation on March 12, consider again the questions you are considering as you write your counterstory/critical narrative and the final “letter” to future consultants. Think, too, about how these questions are impacting your work on the conference presentation. Imagine this activity as brainstorming and organizing—not as something that has to be polished, finished, or otherwise “perfected.”

Combine your research on [the topic/issue\(s\) you presented on March 12](#) with the questions in the [categories below](#). Doing so allows you to think about these questions through particular topics/issues and through particular scholars’ work and theories.

**Step 2:** Click on the [linked hypertext below](#) corresponding to the category or categories you find most interesting. Feel free to explore multiple categories. When you settle on the questions that most resonate with you, list some texts, scholars/authors, and other materials, including notes from our sessions and your own coursework in your degree program, that might help you answer these questions.

Again, your job is NOT to answer the questions yet. Your work here is to just draw on the reading and thinking you did for the March 12 session and to start looking back through all that you’ve experienced in the Project and beyond to choose some materials that might help you to answer the questions—and, potentially, to pose new questions in response.

Of course, you can imagine new categories and rearrange questions. You are not restricted to just the categories listed for you below. These are just some possibilities that Elaine, David, and James pulled together from what we’ve read in your WP blogs and heard you saying in sessions. Feel free to branch away and find your own categories and questions, if you prefer.

Also, start thinking about what forms you might answer the questions *through*. Do you want your work to be poetic? Narrative? Expository? Analytical? Multimodal? Different combinations of these forms? Other forms like Twitter threads, Instagram stories, etc.? Other forms? *Look back at the forms you’ve been seeing in our materials and consider the forms you feel will most effectively express what you have to say in terms of the questions within this category.*

**Step 3:** Prepare a 5-minute presentation to the group that explains the following:

- What topics/issues you plan to focus on in your narrative work + “letter” to future consultants + presentation contribution
- What questions you are asking through and within these topics/issues—regarding your work in writing centers, the meaning and purpose of writing centers and our work, and your own work as a student and professional-in-training
- What forms you’re thinking of writing all of this up in

- What quotes and ideas from the reading/listening for this session is influencing your thinking about all of the above

**Summary:** Again, what will you do for this prep activity?

1. **Draw on** your reading and thinking for the March 12 session, and **look back** through all the Project materials that you've responded to and developed since October.
2. **Explore** categories and questions, possibly **creating** your own—through the lens of the topics/issues you presented on March 12. (**NOTE:** Feel free to switch or combine topics/issues)
3. In your WP site, **revise** your list of texts, authors/scholars, and other materials that might help you answer these questions.
4. In your WP site, **revise** your list of forms that you might compose in as you answer the questions.
5. **Prepare** the 5-minute presentation.

## Categories to choose from ...

- **Disciplinary knowledge-making**
- **Storytelling as knowledge-making and truth**
- **The consultant**
- **Consulting as translation and story(telling)**
- **Place and “coming from”**
- **Making knowledge with clients**
- **Habits of white language**
- **Joy**
- **Writing center and consultant purpose**
- **The white imagination, perception, and writing centers**
- **Language/languageing**

**Disciplinary knowledge-making:** How do your disciplines talk about truth and knowledge? How do your discipline(s) produce/make knowledge? How are these ways of making opposed to other cultural and disciplinary ways of making and valuing knowledge? What have you learned in the Project that conflicts with your discipline(s) ways of making knowledge or thinking about writing and languaging? How do these specific ways of thinking and making knowledge come to bear on your WC practice, your thinking about writing and clients, and language politics? And come to bear on your understanding of yourself as a student and consultant?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**Storytelling as knowledge-making and truth:** (How) does storytelling work in your discipline(s) as a form of knowledge-making? What ways have you've learned—in the Project or beyond it—to make stories and metaphors? How have these practices and ways of thinking emerged in your WC work with clients or your thinking about writing and languaging (e.g., whether or not or how or if your own (auto)biographical knowledge of yourself, family, language practices, neighborhood, family, etc. can be admitted as knowledge and truth in your disciplinary spaces vs. writing center work)?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**The consultant:** Why you? Why are you a writing center consultant? What makes you capable of this work? How have your own literacies and background served this work? How have you had to deviate from your disciplinary training to do this work? At what moment did you feel WC work was possible for you—like really possible? What changes in your own work as a student or in another job or field or clinical placement accompanied your realization (if any)?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**Consulting as translation and story(telling):** How are you learning and experiencing translating theories of writing center practice—and or of writing in general and/or of language and languaging through storytelling? What metaphors are you imagining to help explain your experience?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**Place and “coming from”:** How does the question “Where are you from?” factor into your experiences as a writing center consultant, a student, and/or a professional-in-training? Why? What theories have you explored in the Project or beyond that help you make sense of this question and—very importantly—how you want/choose to answer it?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**Making knowledge with clients:** What artifacts have you made as a consultant and student that represent your experience with clients, writing, and languaging? With this Project? With theory? (E.g., “moves” you make as a tutor in a session; ways you write client report forms; the language you use to talk about linguistic justice with a client; the way you think about and talk about standardized grammar; etc.) How do you see or anticipate seeing these artifacts or “moves” impacting your work as a student and future professional?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**Habits of white language:** What's your relationship to white language supremacy produced by the habits of white language? To the inherent violence of these habits, especially against BIPOC clients? What ways can/do you make knowledge about writing and make knowledge about how to do writing with clients in consultations? How do you build trust? What ways do you overcome your own feelings of inadequacy and fear of not knowing enough to do this work?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**Joy:** What are the affective/emotional/psychological dimensions of your work as a consultant? How do you get clients storytelling about what they do as writers and especially what they do well as writers and human beings? How do you show transparency in your sessions about your struggles with consulting, with the habits of white language, with trust building with clients? What “moves” do you/can you make to restore the joy of talking about writing and languaging, about the value of this messy, uncertain work (not just getting words on the page, but also the talk and debate and challenges involved negotiating and considering social contexts and justice and equity, etc.)?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**Writing center and consultant purpose:** What's a writing center for? What are narratives we create for ourselves and for others? Who has access? Who does not? What dis/abilities are rendered invisible by the decor, ideologies, and politics of a writing center? Why are you even in a writing center in the first place? Why have you stayed after all this hard work in the Project? What internal and external conflicts have emerged for you as you've read and talked about being in a writing center and playing a role in its narrative(s)? Where are you located in your own writing center's narrative(s)?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**The white imagination, perception, and writing centers:** How do you think writing centers—as circulators of white language supremacy and the concurrent violent organizing of BIPOC bodies through structures for “improvement” (Lockett, 2019)—believe BIPOC students view and understand these centers? How do you think you, as a consultant, look or appear to clients—now that you’ve read Black rhetorical theories by folks like bell hooks and now that you’ve started to articulate your position and ways of identifying with a writing center? How do you think you, as a consultant, appear in the imaginations of BIPOC clients (and potential clients) who might not see you the way you think they see you and the writing center?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

**Language/languageing:** In what ways do you, yourself, language? What literacies and languaging practices do you bring to the consultations you have with clients? What's valuable about your own language repertoire of practices—in terms of communicating with clients and working with them toward practical understanding of writing in the academy? In what ways do your experiences with literacies of all kinds—not just reading and writing—reflect what you believe about clients' language learning and making? How do you view vernacular language use? What strategies and practices—what “moves”—can/do you make with clients to be transparent about your biases regarding language(ing) and race and other ways of identification? How do you confront your own literacies and histories behind/guiding those literacies? What do you have to say about the ways class, status, gender, and power shape your literacies? How can you/we language with clients so that we stop the violence of white language supremacy? What practical, in-the-moment moves can we make? How? When? How can/might you transfer these strategies and practices into your work as a student and future professional?

Theories/scholarship/scholars:

Forms: To answer the questions, will you write poetry, narrative, analytical prose, etc?

## **Addendum: Topics/Issue(s) addressed in the March 12 session**

### **Categories to choose from ...**

- **Dis/ability, accessibility, and wellness dimensions of center work**
- **LGBTQAI+ communities and the center**
- **Decolonialism, Indigenous sovereignty, and immigration in the writing center**
- **Race, space, and place: writing center and beyond**
- **Crisis and change in the center and beyond**
- **Language, languaging, languagers, and power in the writing center**
- **Professionalism, disciplines, and mentorship in the center and beyond**

## **Dis/ability, accessibility, and wellness dimensions of center work**

- Cedillo (2018) [What does it mean to move?: Race, disability, and critical embodiment pedagogy](#)
- Clements et al (2021) [When support systems need support: Constructing paths to consultant wellness during COVID-19](#) [Video essay]
- Driscoll & Wells (2020) [Tutoring the whole person: Supporting emotional development in writers and tutors](#)
- Powell & Hixson-Bowles (2018) [Too confident or not confident enough?: A quantitative snapshot of writing tutors' writing and tutoring self-efficacies](#)
- Jiang and Casabone (2021) [Menstruating Tutors' Perceptions of Having Free Menstrual Product Access in a Writing Center](#)
- Segrest & Coy (2021) [Conversation shaper: How students' experiences with writing impact their perceptions of writing centers](#)
- superstition [review] an online literary magazine (2020) ['Being seen is not enough.' an Interview with Alice Wong](#) (short interview)
- Wong (2018) [Episode 17: Disability visibility project podcast: Invisible disabilities](#) (32 min.)
- Elston (2015) [Psychological Disability and the Director's Chair: Interrogating the Relationship Between Positionality and Pedagogy](#)
- [Invisibility Disability Project](#) (n.d.)
- Babcock (2015) [Disabilities in the writing center](#)
- Anglesey & McBride (2019) [Caring for students with disabilities: \(Re\)defining welcome as a culture of listening](#)
- Rinaldi (2015) [Disability in the writing center: A new approach \(that's not so new\)](#)
- DeBruin (2020) [Editing is easy; tutoring is Hard: Helping writers with learning disabilities](#)

### **LGBTQAI+ communities and the center**

- Cimpian & Herrington (Eds.) (2017) [Special Issue of Educational Researcher Examines LGBTQ Issues in Education](#) (NOTE: choose *one* piece in the edition or offer an overview across pieces, highlighting connections/relationships among them)
- Anonymous (2021) Queering the writing center: [Part one](#) and [part two](#)
- Herrmann (2017) [Brave/r spaces Vs. safe spaces for LGBTQ+ in the writing center: Theory and practice at the University of Kansas](#)
- Denny (2010) [Queering the writing center](#)
- Anonymous (2018) [Queering the air: Increasing LGBTQ+ inclusivity in the writing center](#)
- Pfeiffer (2020) [Queer theory in the writing center](#)
- G (2020) [IWCA Presentation – Making transitions: Gender identity and the writing center](#)

## **Decolonialism, Indigenous sovereignty, and immigration in the center**

- García (2017) [Unmaking gringo centers](#) [Access through your school's JSTOR]
- Tuck & Yang (2012) [Decolonialism is not a metaphor](#)
- Flores (2017) [Saying we are nation of immigrants doesn't make it true](#)
- Flores (2018) [Four narratives to avoid when talking about immigrants](#)
- [#standingrocksyllabus](#) (n.d.)
- Bawarshi & Pelkowsky (1999) [Postcolonialism and the idea of a writing center](#)
- Walker & Passafiume (2022) [Imagining the decolonizing writing center: From standard edited English to returning the land](#) [*Praxis* special issue]
- Wilkerson (2020) *Caste: The origins of our discontent* (ONLY pp. 25-32 and 361-364)  
[See PDFs attached to an email]

## **Race, space, and place: Writing center and beyond**

- Camarillo (2019) [Dismantling neutrality: Cultivating antiracist writing center ecologies](#)
- Thier, et al (2021) [Productive disruptions: The struggle towards equity in writing center work](#)
- Habet (2017) [Antiracist Writing Pedagogy: Racialized Places of Labor and Listening](#)
- Blake (2021) [White supremacy, with a tan](#)
- Camarillo (2019) [Burn the House Down: Deconstructing the Writing Center as Cozy Home](#)
- Jackson (2019) [What's missing from white fragility? Robin DiAngelo's idea changed how white progressives talk about themselves—and little else](#)
- Racial Equity Tools (2020) [System of white supremacy and white privilege](#)
- Nolan (2022) [It's time for white people to have tough conversations with their white friends and relatives](#)
- Okun (2021) [White supremacy culture](#)
- Wood (2020) [Episode 28: Frankie Condon](#) [*Pedagogue* podcast]
- Rough Translation [podcast] [May We Have This Dance?](#)
- Yassmin Abdel-Magied (2017) [I tried to fight racism by being a "model minority" — and then it backfired](#)
- Brown (2021) [Black butterfly project](#)
- Walker & Pavlik (2021) [Conversation shaper: Writing, incarceration, and healing in the writing center](#)

### **Crisis and change in the center and beyond**

- Mayo, Dixon, & Camarillo (2021) [Navigating and adapting writing centers through a pandemic: Justifying our work in new contexts](#)
- Racial Equity Tools (2021) [Accountability](#)
- American Federation of Teachers (2018) [Creating sanctuary for students fearful of deportation](#)
- Melaku & Beeman (2020) [Academia isn't a safe haven for conversations about race and racism](#)
- Eastern Carolina University Writing Center (2022) [Consultants advocating for linguistic justice](#)
- CCCC (2020) [This ain't another statement! This is a DEMAND for Black linguistic justice!](#)
- Banville, Dibrell, & Gonzalez (Eds.) [The Peer Review \(4.2\): Researching and Restoring Justice](#) (NOTE: choose *one* piece in the edition or offer an overview across pieces, highlighting connections/relationships among them)
- Madden & Eodice (2016) [Praxis \(14.1\) Access and equity in graduate writing support](#) (NOTE: choose *one* piece in the edition or offer an overview across pieces, highlighting connections/relationships among them)
- Gramlich (2019) [Talking through: The detriment of avoidant discourse in WC allyship](#)

## Language, languaging, languagers, and power in the writing center

- Latta (2019) [Can't fix anyone: Confronting our historical love affair with deficit thinking](#)  
[Starts on page 17]
- Cedillo & Bratta (2019) [Relating our experiences: The practice of positionality stories in student-centered pedagogy](#)
- McCusker and Cohen (2012) [Tower of babble: Nonnative speakers navigate the world of 'good' and 'bad' English](#)
- Kranek & Carvajal Rigerdor (2021) [It's crowded in here: "Present Others" in advanced graduate writers' sessions](#)
- Denny & Towle (2017) [Braving the waters of class: Performance, intersectionality, and the policing of working class identity in everyday writing centers](#)
- Richards (2018) ["Maybe he's the Green Lantern": Low socioeconomic status in the university writing center](#)
- Mackiewicz & Thompson (2015) [Motivational scaffolding, politeness, and writing center tutoring](#)
- CCCC (2021) [Statement on white language supremacy](#)
- Inoue (2021) [Habits of white language \(HOWL\)](#)
- Fleck (2015) [Englishes, racism, & me: A love story](#)
- Baker-Bell & Kynard (2022) [Black language syllabus](#)
- Colton (2020) [Who \(according to students\) uses the writing center?: Acknowledging impressions and misimpressions of writing center services and user demographics](#)
- Williams, A. D. (2019). ["I can't do cartwheels, so I write": Students' writing affect](#)

## **Professionalism, disciplines, and graduate mentorship in the center and beyond**

- CCCC (2019) [Statement of Professional Guidance for Mentoring Graduate Students](#)
- Madden (2020) [Valuing lived experiences \[of graduate student writers\] and community mentorship](#) [Scroll down to “TOC and Sample Chapter to download PDF]
- Interprofessional Education Collaborative (2016) [Core competencies for interprofessional collaborative practice](#)
- World Health Organization (2010) [Framework for action on interprofessional education & collaborative practice](#)
- Canfield et al. (2020) [Science communication demands a critical approach that centers inclusion, equity, and intersectionality](#)
- Canfield & Menezes (2020) [The State of inclusive science communication: A landscape study](#)