

# Chapter 4. Disrupting White Mainstream English in a Hispanic- Serving Institution: Reflections from Two Latina Writing Instructors

Lizbett Tinoco and Sonya Barrera Eddy

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-SAN ANTONIO

*Sonya: Everything about me has been questioned and assessed for validity. I am a Tejana who grew up in Arizona. Let me begin with a conversation that was formative for me pedagogically as an instructor at the university level. I recall sitting in an undergraduate food and nutrition class at Northern Arizona University; when we were having a discussion about culture and food, the professor asked the class to raise their hands if they immigrated. She then asked students whose parents immigrated to raise their hands. She went to grandparents, then great grandparents, and only three students remained with their hands down, me and two Diné students. The professor seemed a little exasperated with me. She turned to me and said, “I know why these two didn’t raise their hands, but what’s your excuse?”*

*Asao Inoue (2021a) argues “words have real effects on us, emotionally, physically, even spiritually” (p. 8). Maybe that is the reason that a single line of spoken language has stayed with me all this time. I remember it clearly. I can hear the tone and inflection, even though it was not said out of malice. The weight of the sentence comes from the fact that she questioned the validity of my entire existence with one word: “excuse.” I was asked to provide an excuse for my existence. This professor couldn’t see beyond her own colonial frameworks to understand that the Southwest in particular had a history beyond “American” colonization. My family has been in the area that was once known as the territories of Coahuila y Tejas since 1760. I am a fifth generation U.S. citizen, because one of my relatives was born in Starr County in 1852. Even though my family has been in Texas for longer than Texas has been a state, I was seen as a foreigner, so much so that I was offered ESL classes in elementary school. Now, as an instructor at the university level, I understand what my professor was trying to communicate through this activity. She was trying to make the point that there are many things about food that are cultural and that we must take into account these cultural aspects of food when we are talking about supporting the nutritional needs of diverse populations. My professor seemed to understand and was sensitive to the history of Native Americans in our class, but she couldn’t conceptualize anything outside of the narrow framework of settler colonialism. I think maybe she wanted to know what wrench I was trying to throw into her world view. I wasn’t trying to be rebellious or divisive. I was naive and didn’t understand*

*the question. My response was simple, I said, “I am from Texas.” I have spent my life trying to prove the validity of my existence and also judging and policing my own language in the process.*

*Liz: “I’m sorry, I don’t understand Spanish.” “¿Me puedes traducir lo que dice esta señora?” As I reflect on my language experiences as a first-generation Mexican-American Latina whose first language is Spanish, I don’t ever recall a moment where my family or I weren’t judged, or assessed, by our language practices. I clearly remember the many times we would get phone calls, after spending hours leaving business cards for my mom’s housekeeping business around all the beach homes in Oxnard, California, only for my brother and me to translate for my mom. See, these moments of translation were a means of survival for my family—this meant work for my mom and the ability for my parents to pay bills, buy food, and other basic necessities. However, there were times when I would get on the phone to translate, and the person on the line was not interested in hiring someone who didn’t speak English. Even worse were the instances when I would come along with my mom to consultations, only to witness how rude and racist some of the White women were due to her “broken English.” “Sorocco?” as one woman stated, pronouncing my mom’s name wrong. However, not all of my early childhood memories around language were negative. The one thing I remember is that all of these moments of translation would happen in community—with family. If I didn’t know a word or phrase, I could lean on this community, knowing they wouldn’t judge.*

Our narratives throughout this chapter give you glimpses of how our past experiences influence what we do in the classroom, especially when it comes to assessment. For the two of us, assessing a student’s writing is a complicated and fraught topic at best, and is more complicated when the academic system we work in asks us to assess and judge students’ personal language and culture, all while we are constantly forced to validate our own existence in academic spaces. Our past lived experiences take on additional weight for us both and we are highly affected by the sociopolitical and economical context of the city and state in which we live and teach. Though we come from different backgrounds, we are both Latinas who teach at Texas A&M-San Antonio (A&M-SA). We work in a department where we are surrounded by colleagues who are dedicated, like we are, to developing antiracist and decolonial writing pedagogies, assessment practices, and curriculum. A&M-SA is a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) with over 72 percent of students who identify as Hispanic. As our adopted College of Arts and Sciences land acknowledgement states, we are a university that is located on the Yanaguana, named for the life-giving waters of the San Antonio River. It is on the homelands of many indigenous people, including the Tap Pilam Coahuiltecan Nation, Payaya, Coahuilteca, Lipan Apache, and Comanche, as well as other diasporic peoples from the southern Plains, eastern United States, and Mexico. Due to the physical and cultural violence of colonialism in the area on which the university is situated, on the ranchlands of the former Mission San Francisco de

la Espada and former Mission San Antonio de Valero, these colonial legacies are deeply sewed into the mission of the university. The idea of “mission” can be seen in various ways, from our university slogan to the architecture of our buildings to the ways in which students are expected to perform White standard language practices.

Our university writing programs have begun to identify how White standard language ideology permeates through our curriculum and pedagogy and to challenge ourselves to find ways to resist and enact more socially just writing curricula. As a department, we are constantly looking to implement more equitable writing assessment practices, and as a result of these often difficult but necessary conversations, many faculty in our writing programs have moved towards implementing community-based pedagogies, in particular labor-based assessment in their courses (Tinoco et al., 2020). Like our colleagues, we have been using and reflecting on this form of assessment for several years, and in conversations with them, we both continually raise the questions: What are student experiences with labor-based assessment? Do students perceive this form of assessment as antiracist and socially just? We do this because we feel that students’ voices are important and we both believe that students should always be at the center of best practices. If we discount student voices in determining best practices in our situational context, we risk simply reforming White language ideologies into newer shinier systems of oppression. As we are working with other faculty towards creating antiracist and decolonial writing programs, we must remind them that we are firmly rooted in community and collaborative based pedagogies. For us, as two Latinas, these concepts are deeply rooted in cultural and familial experiences (Yosso, 2005) and not simply academic frameworks. We both work best in community and in collaboration with others, including students, so throughout this chapter, you will have glimpses of our personal experiences through short narratives about our implementation of collaborative assessment practices.

We must acknowledge at this point that this work is never ending. Antiracist work is constant work. For years before we arrived at our institution, this work was done quietly, and our colleagues shied away from writing about this work because it seemed messy and incomplete. We have written previously about the spirit of *comadrisimo* (Ribero & Arellano, 2019) that exists between us as Latinas in academia, and with that spirit, we have embraced the messiness of our work and become determined to write about it. We know that we are only making small strides, but we are willing to perform that *comadrisimo* for a wider audience in order to be transparent, allowing others to see that this work is emotionally and physically taxing and requires constant reflection. Nevertheless, we continue to actively work towards a better future for our students and our communities.

For years, scholars (Huot, 2002; Inoue, 2005; Litterio, 2018; White, 1994) have advocated for community-based assessment, which gives students the opportunity to be involved in the assessment process. According to Inoue, community-based assessment pedagogy “integrates assessment with the teaching of writing so that

students not only learn to assess themselves, taking active learning stances in the classroom, but they begin to articulate how assessment and writing work in their own writing practices” (2005, p. 209). One feature of Inoue’s community-based assessment pedagogy is that students develop rubrics for their assignments in conversation with their peers (2005). Moreover, Eric Turley and Chris Gallagher (2008) argue rubrics are a “product of a particular community of writers” (p. 90). They argue for us to move away from the binary of viewing rubrics as good or bad, but rather move to understand what they do, how they shape our practices, and who they benefit. More recently, Joe Cirio (2019) argued that the negotiation process hinges on three aspects: “[that] students know what their own values are, that students have a language to articulate tacit writing values, and that students’ explicit language is robust enough to account for the complexity of their writing” (p. 101). In reading these scholars, we discussed the language of rubrics, the use and misuse of rubrics, and the ways in which we have used rubrics.

*Liz: I came to recognize the harm enacted by rubrics and instructors who assess using a single standard during my graduate program, at a HSI with over 83 percent Latinx students, many who speak Spanish and live along the US-Mexico border. In this FYC program, student writing was assessed using standardized rubrics and expected to approximate White mainstream English (Baker-Bell, 2020). During my first two years as a teaching assistant in this program, I asked myself “Why wouldn’t a program draw from the rich linguistic knowledge students bring with them to the classroom? Why would students’ grades be penalized if their writing showed evidence of Spanish?” My personal trauma from previous experiences with assessment and language, which I won’t rehash here, were brought back to the forefront of my teaching, and I felt ill-equipped as a graduate student to address these critical linguistic questions.*

*As someone who speaks both English and Spanish, I often communicated and related writing concepts to them in Spanish. I learned that for some students, speaking Spanish, code meshing, and code switching were all needed as they navigated school, work, and even, crossing the border. I listened to students terrified about losing scholarships or their student visas, not being able to afford paying to retake a class, or their dreams at their career and socioeconomic advancement for themselves and their families shattered if they did not pass their writing courses with certain grades. I listened to other instructors, who didn’t understand Spanish, constantly complain about students in their courses speaking Spanish. As I heard the numerous stories from students about their experiences with being judged and their intelligence questioned due to their English writing and speaking skills, I found it important to push back on the assessment practices used by the first-year composition program that drew from best practices in the discipline.*

*As I continued my graduate school journey, I did not want to participate in a practice that was racist and harmful to students. During this time, the first-year composition program was going through a transition, so I was able to advocate and*

*design a class that incorporated community-based assessment pedagogy (Inoue, 2005). Student buy-in was difficult because as Beatrice Mendez-Newman (2007) describes, young adults in traditional Hispanic families are often raised not to question authority figures and to accept the judgments (grades) by teachers. In order to get student-buy in, students collaborated in creating their assessment tools—the rubrics. Collaborative rubrics prompted more student agency, and students were more comfortable talking about assessment with their peers and instructors (Tinoco & Lawrence, 2018).*

**Sonya:** *For me rubrics were essential in learning how to write academically. I earned my BA back in the 1990s in creative writing and worked in copy writing and public affairs prior to moving home to San Antonio in 2007. I started graduate school in 2009. This was a pivotal moment for our economy and for my family. My husband lost his job in the recession, and I became the sole provider for our family. I went from working part-time and attending graduate school to working full-time while taking my teaching certification courses and attending graduate school. It was this experience of entering graduate school at the same time that I was taking my teacher certification that planted the seed for this research. I was floundering in my first academic courses at a time when I was learning how to teach. One of the tools I was learning to use was a rubric. I was being taught how to use the rubric to teach students what to expect. At the time, I did not analyze the White habitus (Inoue, 2015) in the conventions or the White mainstream English or WME (Baker-Bell, 2020). I simply knew that by learning to develop these rubrics for my students, I was learning what the expectations were for me in graduate school. This idea was in my mind as Liz and I discussed community-based assessment and the idea that students could develop rubrics in conversation with their peers.*

The above conversation solidified our understanding that our own pedagogical praxis could not help but be informed by our lived experiences and we realized the same must be true for our students. This led us to not only find ways to include students and their experiences in various dimensions of our courses, more specifically, in assessment, at our current institution, A&M-SA, but to find ways to take tools that are traditionally used to discipline or police language, and use them to empower students to make personal choices. This came about as a result of our desire to ask students to be critical of their language education, even though we were aware that for many students this language education is vital to upward mobility and job security in a system that was not designed for them. We built on the work of scholars who have advocated for community-based, collaborative, and antiracist assessment practices.

Our work here is influenced by Cruz Medina and Kenneth Walker's (2018) call for a social justice turn to assessment as

evaluation and assessment should both work to critique the exercise of privilege and be inclusive of non-White students with

varying levels of privilege. It is not enough to commit to an exercise of critique of the systems that we navigate if we cannot give them concrete ways to navigate these systems. Simply drawing attention to racism and oppression for students who are experiencing these marginalizations can result in a learned helplessness that perpetuates the systems. (p. 47)

To counteract this learned helplessness, we decided to use the most ubiquitous tool students are often handed, the rubric.

We decided on the rubric for several reasons. First, we thought that students' understanding of how and why they were being assessed would open the lines of communication and help them feel comfortable discussing assessment with other instructors. We also felt it would help them learn conventions of different writing genre. We also felt it would give them a more active role in their assessment instead of being passive about the grades they've earned in other classes. We hoped that understanding assessment in this way would increase their confidence and thereby increase their risk-taking ability in their writing process. You can see from our narratives that rubrics have had both positive and negative effects on us as individuals. We teach students how to create rubrics and teach them how to use them for their own benefit, instead of having rubrics used against them. In the Fall of 2020, we conducted an IRB approved study on Latinx students and their use of collaborative rubrics. For this study, we positioned ourselves as teacher-researchers and used our own classes to learn how rubrics could encourage students to make choices in their own writing (Tinoco & Eddy, 2023). What follows is our critical reflection of what we learned as teacher-researchers.

Although the Latinx students in this study were open to being active members of the assessment process and engaging in discussions about structural racist assessment practices used to make judgments on student's writing, participants engaged in behaviors which were rooted in upholding a grade and writing in Standard Academic English. One of the most important things we learned from this study is that student agency in writing assessment does not equate to social and linguistic justice in assessment if students continue to hold dominant habits of White language (Inoue, 2021b).

One of the first things we did in our lesson plan was to ask students to critically engage with a discussion about the assessment ecology in the classroom. For us, assessment ecology has many moving parts and it is always changing, never static. First, there is an assessment ecology in each of our classrooms, which operates within the structure of our university. Furthermore, the university assessment ecology also operates within the legislative regulations, such as placement and testing. Lastly, and most importantly we must recognize that students and instructors bring all of their lived experiences with them into the each of these various nodes of the assessment ecology, adding to its complexity. For this reason,



we embrace Inoue's (2015) idea that systems work in relation to each other and assessment ecologies have a component of sustainability. As Inoue (2015) argues,

If our writing assessment ecologies in our classrooms don't pay attention to the dialectical way those ecologies affect students and the students affect them or the way they affect and change us as teachers, they may simply be ecologies of measurement, mechanism of pure accountability. (p. 80)

To open this conversation about assessment ecologies we first invited students to begin a discussion about language and power through a reflection and creation of rubrics.

*Sonya: I first began by laying the groundwork and talking about the different types of code switching that students do in the classroom. We discussed our different types of literacies (Kalantzis et al., 2016) as well as the types of code switching (Auer, 2013) that we often engage in in these differing rhetorical situations. Students didn't seem to have any trouble making these connections with code switching. They felt comfortable discussing the ways in which they engaged in this practice. We then discussed code meshing (Young & Barrett, 2018), and this is where students began to struggle with our discussion. They often spoke about the freedom that codemeshing allowed and were in support of it, but then their practice in the classroom was markedly different. I noticed this when we did our first discussion of rubrics. We used the Rubristar website which is designed for teachers to build rubrics without having to deeply understand the content area. It is a tool with built-in language and teachers can simply choose different categories they want to assess and the program creates the rubric breakdown for them.*

*Liz: I implemented the same activity in an upper division course, Introduction to Composition Studies, and a graduate course, Theory and Practice of Teaching Writing. I asked students to read Asao B. Inoue's (2015) "The Function of Race in Writing Assessment," and although the majority of students agree with Inoue's claims that assessing everyone's writing by the same standards is racist, they all discussed how their pedagogy is often in conflict with what is required from their current or future jobs as teachers. For example, one graduate student who is a teacher at a local high school on the east side of San Antonio, a predominately African American community, mentioned how she teaches in ways that are culturally responsive to the students, but then has to make a switch to teach curriculum and assess student writing the way it would be assessed on standardized state tests. This student discussed the real impact these test scores have on students' educational experiences and her own working conditions. This impact shows up for teachers in the form of job performance evaluations and funding for the entire school, which is often based on test scores. We then shifted the conversation to discuss how writing assessment has been used to assess their own writing. Students seemed excited to be creating a rubric as a means to provide feedback to their peers, instead of using a rubric that*

would be used to judge their writing in order to earn a grade. One student mentioned that reading their peer's draft and not having a direction on what to comment on was overwhelming and anxiety inducing. This student discussed how the peer revision process is sometimes a "free-for-all" process. They recalled having received papers with tons of marks and comments and not knowing where to get started on revisions. Thus, the collaborative rubrics created within their writing groups would give them guidance on two or three things they needed to hone in on during the revision process. Like Sonya, I also invited students to use Rubistar, but many opted out of using the program because they didn't like the prescriptive language used, and instead, they created rubrics using their own language practices to provide more targeted feedback for their peers.

In following our lesson plans and inviting students to be active participants of the assessment ecology of our classrooms, we at least initiated a critical discussion about White mainstream English habits and practices. We opened up our classroom spaces and invited students to be vulnerable while critically examining how racist discourse produces false narratives and deficit thinking about their writing practices. But all of these critical discussions were not transferred into the assessment tools they created. Students were candid and vulnerable in discussion, but fell into a system of creating rubrics that the instructor wanted to see.

*Sonya: I began by discussing examples of rubrics from other classes. The students ranked these rubrics and placed them in two categories "appropriate to evaluate the task at hand" and "Not appropriate to evaluate the task at hand." We had wonderful discussions in class about what types of rubrics work and why. We discussed how we might use the rubric to guide our writing. The student-created rubrics that would allow each author to visualize what they felt was important in their writing. This would give the peer evaluator an idea of what to read/look for. With the idea that a rubric is a guide created by the author to help the peer in evaluation of the work we began our work. The students agreed that creating the rubrics was critical to their prewriting and planning stages. After our initial discussions I noticed that students did not create their own rubrics and give them to their peers at our first workshop.*

*When I questioned the students, a few were brave enough to explain that they were unsure how to create their own rubrics. I created a template and planned scaffolding that would guide the students to rubric creation with a gradual release of responsibility from the instructor to the students, so that they could gain skills in rubric creation. Students were enthusiastic and began using the rubric, however very few of the students took the rubrics that were given to them and made them their own. Once I no longer provided the scaffolding and students were able to create their own rubrics, in any format they wished, many simply reverted back to the original rubric scaffolding I provided or replicated the types of rubrics that they were familiar with from high school. These were the very types of rubrics that they critiqued early in the class. These rubrics turned up attached to their essay for peer*



*evaluation with WME conventions being weighted heavily and included categories such as “grammar” and “spelling.”*

*I have contemplated why students reverted to “traditional” rubrics that they were familiar with from high school, because I feel like there could be several reasons this happened: Students could have simply found themselves overwhelmed by their work in their college courses and as progressed in the semester they could have spent less time thinking about their writing and evaluation of their writing because of their workload. Having students turn in the rubric along with their essays conforms with the conventional use of rubrics as a grading tool. Students could have then been confused by the purpose of the rubric and not seen it as a tool and guide for themselves but a tool for grading. I think some of our data reflects this confusion. I think that we were overestimating the impact that these discussions can have on students. It seems like it will take more than a few good conversations in a class to undo the years of being raised in the secondary education system and being acculturated to accept WME as the standard of writing.*

*Liz: Sonya, you allowed your students to have time in groups to view different rubrics and to build their own rubrics, so did I. I was surprised by the fact that after so much animated and supportive discussion of code meshing, students in your class were reluctant to be critical of the rubrics. They often spoke in support of White mainstream English and how having an “academic standard” helped the teacher to evaluate them and to succeed. I didn’t expect this dissonance. It appears students were grappling with the fact that they knew they would be evaluated and judged on their language practices, and they were self policing and choosing the very types of assessment practices you were asking them to be critical of through this activity.*

*The issue my classes faced was moving away from the hierarchy that exists with rubrics. Visually, students didn’t like how rubrics, including those from Rubistar, create hierarchical relationships between content. To help alleviate this issue, some students did not assign point values to these different categories, and some groups even moved away from the traditional table structure of rubrics.*

From the data in our study, graduate students and upper division undergraduates who had more exposure to antiracist frameworks in our program had a better understanding of what we were trying to accomplish and were less likely to reinforce White language norms. Graduate students were able to create the collaborative rubrics as a way to provide feedback to their peers, but there was a minimal number of lower division undergraduate students who understood the value of the practice of writing rubrics or to use it as a tool to plan their own writing in the way that we were hoping. However, we don’t want to assume a false equivalency that more exposure to antiracist practices led students to engage less in habits of White language. The increase in student’s confidence could be that students were familiar in navigating different assessment ecologies and our institutional space.

We both learned so much from involving students in the assessment process. Both of us would often get together and discuss the complexities about this practice, and we hope to capture some of the major takeaways in this reflective portion of the chapter where we speak to how this practice has changed our approach to assessment. Let us first start by saying that we don't use collaborative rubrics in the classroom—as a matter of fact, we both completely stopped using rubrics since students were still using rubrics as a way to approximate White mainstream English. The discussions around them, while fruitful, did not transfer directly into action for students and we are reminded of Audre Lorde's (2007) admonition that "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (p. 112). We feel as if it would take much more time and exposure for students to get to a place where they could use the tool of the rubric in a different way than we have time for in an introduction to composition course. This is also confusing for students who are just beginning to be exposed to antiracist pedagogical frameworks. Using a tool of racism in an antiracist way is a very different and nuanced approach and students can easily be confused and think that we are teaching how to build and use rubrics in the way that they are used in WME.

Another major reason for moving away from rubrics was to create a classroom environment and community where students are encouraged to take risks. By taking risks, we mean asking students to approach writing assignments in the best way they see fit, instead of worrying how their writing is going to be assessed with a rubric. For us, risk-taking really gets at the core of creating a growth mindset (Dweck, 2012) for students. This means constantly iterating to students that if a part of the writing process did not go as they intended, it doesn't mean they should give up. Risk-taking doesn't have to be negative, and it can take on many forms for students. For some students, taking a risk can mean asking us or their peers more questions, being more open to feedback, collaborating with peers, or reflecting on why a part of the writing process did not go as planned.

One of the things that we discovered as we reflected on this study is that student agency in writing assessment does not necessarily equate to social and linguistic justice in assessment. Many students continue to hold dominant habits of White language (Inoue, 2021b) and also find it difficult to let these standards go. As Wonderful Faison writes in Chapter 2 of this collection, student's resistance to Black English, or in our case, Spanglish, "is political, racist, and classist and is meant to maintain the social order." Many students have a need to become proficient in White mainstream English because they view these habits and practices as their pathway to success, acceptance, and social mobility. These students have a very real fear that they will be rejected from jobs, promotions, and excluded in many different ways if they are unable to engage in these White habits of language. Although the two of us use antiracist and social justice pedagogies in our classrooms (Baker-Bell, 2020; Chavez, 2020; Inoue, 2015; Kendi, 2019; Paris & Alim, 2017), seeing how many students uphold White mainstream English in their work can be exhausting and cause emotional fatigue. In addition, constantly

discussing the racial and linguistic injustices Black, Latinx, and other minoritized students experience in education can be overwhelming. This means that as Latinas, every semester, in an effort to be transparent and foster trust we must often disclose our experiences and trauma associated with our literacy practice, which makes this work very personal. These are traumas and experiences that we share with students but that we will not explicate here, in order to avoid trauma porn. What we wish to emphasize here is not our personal experiences, but the reality that students recognize the need to be able to use White mainstream English. As much as we might want to dismantle the system, the system still exists, and these students know that they must exist and work within that system when they exit our classroom. They might feel confident in discussion and doing this work in the protected setting of our classes, but will not take such risks when their graduation, access to jobs or graduate programs, or promotions are on the line.

For the students who are resistant to such practices and insistence on using WME frameworks, we can cause them to disengage from the process of writing and learning by our insistence that they participate in our view of socially just writing. For these students, it becomes critical that we allow them to engage in the part of socially just assessment practices that they are comfortable with, even if it means that they fall back into White mainstream English practices. At the same time, we must continue to provide access to these important ideas, and places for these important discussions, to allow students the space to understand and begin engaging in more socially just writing practices (Villanueva, 1997). Even if they are not in a place where they want to confront or interrogate their own practices, we can still invite them into these conversations, but we cannot force them into accepting our views or ideas. Watching students, especially minoritized students, buy into a racist system is exhausting and can often feel like we are not doing enough.

Which brings us back to the title of this article, “Disrupting White Mainstream English.” We want to address practical ways that instructors can disrupt WME and empower students when it comes to assessment. When different instructors think about disrupting White mainstream English, they may think about different social and cultural norms that are associated with Whiteness that neither of us have considered. We have learned through this project that the way people interact with WME is as varied and individualistic as their writing process. Some of the things that instructors should think about are:

- How does your writing pedagogy disrupt or uphold WME practices?
- Do you have a diverse representation of varieties of English and languages in the texts you incorporate in your classes?
- Are you presenting students with varied culturally diverse rhetorical practices, beyond western rhetorical practices?
- Are students able to see themselves reflected in the academic work you are presenting them?

- Are you presenting students with models of writing that disrupt WME or disciplinary standards?
- Are your assessment practices truly disrupting WME, or are you simply “adopting” assessment practices that others have deemed “antiracist” without critical thought to your application or student population?

We present the reader with questions instead of solutions because we have found that the choice to disrupt or not to disrupt WME is something that is done individually for every student. Very much in the same way that each student must find their own voice as a writer, they will also find their own ways to accept or disrupt WME at the time that they are or are not willing to engage in this work. Their willingness to disrupt WME may change over time. We acknowledge that while writing is socially constructed, it is our job as instructors to frankly describe what WME is so students have a clear picture of what it is and how it functions in their own lives and the lives of others. Then, we must step back and allow students to engage with that information, understanding that as instructors we are unable to prescribe students ways to “disrupt” because disruption, like antiracism, is a personal practice and process.

Oftentimes, we question some of our pedagogical choices and the reasons for doing disruptive work, but we have to constantly remind ourselves of the value of the work we are doing and the importance of continuing towards more antiracist and socially just practices in academia. As Latinas in writing studies, we also have to acknowledge and confront our complicity in systemic racism. Being antiracist educators means that we are constantly aware that there are tensions between our theoretical and pedagogical frameworks as antiracist educators and the disciplinary frameworks we engage with as professionals in writing studies. These tensions keep in the forefront of our minds the fact that we are complicit in the system due to the long history of linguistic violence enacted by our discipline, while working to dismantle this system to create a more socially just education experience for students of color. We remind ourselves constantly that the tension we are feeling IS the work. We must question, critically analyze, and do the best we can at each moment, in each aspect of our work from creating reading lists, to lesson planning, assessment, to our own research and writing. We remind ourselves daily that we may not see the fruits of our labor. We must keep in mind that the impact we have on the system may not become evident until our students replace us in the academy.

## References

- Auer, P. (Ed.). (2013) *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge.
- Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Taylor & Francis Group.

- Chavez, F. R. (2021). *The anti-racist writing workshop How to decolonize the creative classroom*. Haymarket Books.
- Cirio, J. (2019). Meeting the promise of negotiation: Situating negotiated rubrics with students' prior experiences. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 42(2), 100-118. [https://www.wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/asset\\_manager/get\\_file/382234?ver=11](https://www.wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/asset_manager/get_file/382234?ver=11)
- Dweck, C. S. (2012). *Mindset: Changing the way you think to fulfill your potential*. Robinson. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tamsa/detail.action?docID=897458>
- Huot, B. (2002). *Rearticulating writing assessment for teaching and learning*. Utah State University Press.
- Inoue, A. B. (2005). Community-based assessment pedagogy. *Assessing Writing*, 9(3), 208-238.
- Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0698>
- Inoue, A. B. (2021a). *Above the well: An antiracist argument from a boy of color*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Utah State University Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2021.1244>
- Inoue, A. B. (2021b). Blogbook—The habits of White language (HOWL). *Asao B. Inoue's Infrequent Words*. <http://asaobinoue.blogspot.com/2021/07/blogbook-habits-of-white-language-howl.html>
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2016) *Literacies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kendi, I. X. (2019). *How to be an antiracist*. One World.
- Lorde, A. (1984/1993). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Quality Paperback Book Club.
- Litterio, L. (2018). Contract grading in the technical writing classroom: Blending community-based assessment and self-assessment. *Assessing Writing*, 38, 1-9.
- Medina, C., & Walker, K. (2018). Validating the consequences of a social justice pedagogy: Explicit values in course-based grading contracts. In A. M. Hass & M. F. Eble (Eds.), *Key theoretical frameworks: Teaching technical communication in the twenty-first century* (pp. 46-67). Utah State University Press.
- Newman, B. M. (2007). Teaching writing at Hispanic-Serving Institutions. In C. Kirklighter, D. Cardenas, & S. W. Murphy (Eds.), *Teaching writing with Latino/a students: Lessons learned at Hispanic-Serving Institutions* (pp. 17-36). State University of New York Press.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.) (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Ribero, A. M., & Arellano, S. C. (2019). Advocating comadrisimo: A feminist mentoring approach for latinas in rhetoric and composition. *Peitho Journal*, 21(2), 334-356.
- Tinoco, L., & Eddy, S. B. (2023). Rhetoric of rubrics. In M. Reznizki & D. Coad (Eds.), *Dynamic activities for first-year composition*. National Council of Teachers of English Press.
- Tinoco, L., Gage, S., Bliss, A., Baruca, P., Barron, C., & Meyer, C. (2020). Openings, risks, and antiracist futures at a Hispanic-Serving Institutions. *Journal of*

- Writing Assessment*, 13(2). <https://www.journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=151>
- Tinoco, L., & Lawrence, G. (2018). Dismantling writing assessment: Towards collaborative rubrics. In J. Dahlman & P. Selden (Eds.), *Beyond the frontier, volume II: Innovations in first year composition* (pp. 226-236). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Turley, E. D., & Gallagher, C. W. (2008). On the uses of rubrics: Reframing the great rubric debate. *English Journal*, 97(4), 87-92.
- Villanueva, V. (1997). Considerations for American Freireistas. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), *Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader* (pp. 621-637). National Council of Teachers of English Press.
- White, E. M. (1994). *Teaching and assessing writing* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Young, V. A., & Barrett, R. (2018) *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy*. Parlor Press.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91.