Dear Colleagues and Friends~~

This month’s issue includes various genres—articles, symposium contributions, review essay, an exchange, and poster page—that tap both time and space. In these collective texts, we have historical perspectives helping us understand our own past and allowing us to update our present; linkages to other fields of endeavor so as to enhance our own; connections across spaces to other sites of writing around the world; and closer looks at our own sites—hence the title of this introduction. As represented here, our field includes a capacious view, and as we expand sites of inquiry and activity, we have a more robust and complex view. In this introduction, then, I’ll summarize each of these contributions before taking up two other tasks: (1) outlining the treat in store for us, in the combined September and December special issue of College Composition and Communication, when we will learn from colleagues about various and diverse Locations of Writing; and (2) sharing with readers our new policy on remembering those we have lost.
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In our first article, “Expanding the Aims of Public Rhetoric and Writing Pedagogy, Writing Letters to Editors,” Brian Gogan takes up how the conventional assignment of the letter to the editor can be located in what he calls “an approach to public rhetoric and writing pedagogy that is conducted according to the tripartite aims of publicity, authenticity, and efficacy.” Drawing on his work with students, Gogan expands on these single-concept aims to situate them in relationships: publicity-as-condition and publicity-as-action, authenticity-as-location and authenticity-as-legitimation, and efficacy-as-persuasion and efficacy-as-participation. Gogan also argues that we should separate and emphasize the participation the letter-to-the-editor genre entails from the persuasion that may be its aspiration: “when the efficacy of the letter-to-the-editor assignment is expanded so that it is understood in terms of participation that may lead to persuasion, public rhetoric and writing pedagogy embraces the fullness of the ecological model [of writing] by seeing the wide range of effects—persuasive or not—there within.”

Continuing recent work recovering our collective writing pasts, our next article details the experiences of several 19th century women, some of them from the U.S., making their educational way at Cambridge University. In “A Revelation and a Delight”: Nineteenth-Century Cambridge Women, Academic Collaboration, and the Cultural Work of Extracurricular Writing,” L. Jill Lamberton focuses on the writing these women engaged in, especially outside the classroom, in order both to succeed in the classroom and to affect wider spheres of influence. Defining this writing as a form of collaborative peer activity fostering agency, Lamberton identifies three benefits accruing to her 19th century subjects: (1) use of extracurricular writing that “augment and enriched curricular learning”; (2) use of writing to develop social networks and circulation; and (3) use of such writing to “shift public opinion, looking outside the college or university for broader audiences to voice support and agitate for change.”

Mya Poe, Norbert Elliot, John Aloysius Cogan Jr., and Tito G. Nurudeen Jr. return us to the present as they consider how our writing programs can be enhanced: by adapting a legal heuristic used to determine what in the law is called disparate impact. In “The Legal and the Local: Using Disparate Impact Analysis to Understand the Consequences of Writing Assessment,” these colleagues first distinguish between inequities produced by intent from those produced unintentionally—the latter called “disparate impact”—before outlining a three-part question-driven process that can identify such instances and work toward ways of changing them:
Step 1: Do the assessment policies or practices result in an adverse impact on students of a particular race as compared with students of other races?

Step 2: Are the assessment policies or practices necessary to meet an important educational goal?

Step 3: Even in situations where a college or university can demonstrate that the assessment policies or practices are necessary to meet an important educational goal, are there comparably effective alternative policies or practices available that would meet the school's stated educational goal with less of a burden or adverse impact on the disproportionately affected racial group?

This heuristic, of course, outlines a way of thinking likely to be useful to us regardless of where we work—in classrooms, in programs, or both.

Our last article, James Purdy’s “What Can Design Thinking Offer Writing Studies?,” begins his task of thinking about the role of design thinking in writing by analyzing the use of “design language use” in articles appearing in multiple journals in writing studies. As a consequence of this review, Purdy provides a taxonomy of five reasons for articles’ invocation of design: design as (1) planning or structuring; (2) contextualizing composing as multimodal; (3) “recognize[ing] digital, multimedia compositions”; (4) pointing to the material conditions of composing; and (5) “discuss[ing] the academic discipline of design studies.” Given this context, Purdy moves to think more specifically about design thinking and how its approach can inform our own teaching of writing.

This issue of the journal, like the last three June issues of College Composition and Communication, also includes a symposium, here focusing on internationalization. Former Chair of CCCC Charles Bazerman opens the symposium, citing his own wealth of experiences from around the world, with a rationale for going global that his title—“Sisters and Brothers of the Struggle: Teachers of Writing in Their Worlds”—signals well:

I offer a personal perspective on the people engaged in writing in different educational contexts that I have met over the years. This essay is a tribute to them, as well as to all compositionists in the United States, recognizing the shared commitments and experiences that bring us to this line of work, how engagement with student writing and student development form shared sensibilities and characters, and how we have all struggled to enact our values and commitments despite cultural and institutional challenges.
Similarly, addressing the needs of students, Terry Myers Zawacki and Anna Sophia Habib, in “Internationalization, English L2 Writers, and the Writing Classroom: Implications for Teaching and Learning,” focus on the benefits of internationalization, and again for all of us. The concerns of international students, Zawacki and Habib claim, suggest to us the need for more explicit attention to language in our teaching, but not just as a problem for L2 or basic writers but as a rhetorical tool all students can use to move beyond the formulaic, overly generalized “rules” for academic writing in which they’ve been schooled over the years and across the secondary and postsecondary curriculum.

Our next entry is a review essay, Elizabeth Wardle's “Considering What it Means to Teach 'Composition' in the 21st Century.” Wardle reads each text in this context: Tracey Bowen and Carl Whithaus's *Multimodal Literacies and Emerging Genres*; Jay Jordan's *Redesigning Composition for Multilingual Realities*; and Jessica Restaino's *First Semester: Graduate Students, Teaching Writing, and the Challenge of the Middle Ground*. More specifically, Wardle locates her reading of these texts in the context of four questions: (1) What exactly is composing or writing?; (2) What should people teach and learn in composition classes?; (3) Who is being taught in composition classes?; and (4) Who is doing the teaching in composition classes, and what is their expertise? Her conclusion is that the teaching of writing is as challenging as we have ever imagined it:

There is a lot to know about both writing and teaching, and our ability to effectively help our students learn depends a great deal on our understanding of language and language users. That so many of us still operate in institutionalized structures that simply do not recognize these facts and instead act as if there is nothing to know about writing or teaching writing does a disservice to all of us: it does a disservice to our students, who are not learning as they should and could be, and it does a disservice to our discipline, which still struggles mightily to have any role at all in the making of public policy as it relates to writing.

And last but not least, we have a poster page, this one speaking to process, as well as a list of reviewers for the previous year and an index to that year, too.

Our September and December issues make up a combined fifth special issue speaking to *Locations of Writing*; they are moving into production. We will again include vignettes of lived experience; they are complete. Final article manuscripts are arriving and being prepared for copyediting. Our plans
are to include in each issue several vignettes and articles as well as a review essay focusing on books that themselves represent or document locations of writing. The response to last year’s inclusion of vignettes—at least, that shared with me—was enthusiastic, and I hope the response to them this time around will be as well. In addition, the topic itself—one selected by the CCC Editorial Board—is sufficiently capacious that it supports a kind of Bakhtinian unity across differences: translingual students and writing; close-up views of the material practices of writing; “distant” views of the field itself.

One of our new Editorial Board members this year, as announced in the February issue, was Carolyn Handa, professor of English at the University of Alabama. As you may know, Carolyn died just before CCCC, on March 12th. We will miss her. Ironically, our major item of business at our annual CCC Editorial Board meeting this year focused on ways College Composition and Communication might systematically remember those who have died. The journal has remembered many such members, of course, but to date it’s typically been as a two-fold function: at the discretion of the editor, who sometimes knows about such losses and who sometimes doesn’t; and as exigence suggests, exigence often being pegged to the publication schedule of the journal. My query to the Editorial Board at this year’s meeting was whether we might want to work more systematically, and if so, what working systematically might look like. Based on our very good discussion at CCCC, College Composition and Communication is instituting a policy toward remembering and honoring our colleagues; we will publish, each June and December, a list of those members who have passed away. Our first list is included in this issue. As important, we will need your help in this endeavor: toward insuring that no one is overlooked, please be sure to send on such information to me, at <cccedit@yahoo.com>, until December and after that to Jonathan Alexander, at <ccceditors@gmail.com>. It’s no doubt a sign of the maturing of the field—and its members—that we need such a policy; we hope and believe that honoring our colleagues in a thoughtful, intentional way is a gesture the community will find meaningful.

Given the winter most of us have experienced this year, I hope that by the time this June issue is in your hands, you’re enjoying a respite from school and some sunny, warm weather.

Kathleen Blake Yancey
Florida State University