Introduction

Asao B. Inoue
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Kristin DeMint Bailey
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MILWAUKEE

The central themes that run through this collection focus on interrogations of two interconnected areas: (1) the agents who embody antiracist assessment in the classroom and the politics of judgement that form through their interactions; and (2) the stories of joy and failure that offer teachers lessons about the methods and outcomes of collaborative antiracist assessment work with students in classrooms. When teachers with antiracist goals invite students to help them create rubrics, evaluate each other's writing, and reflect upon standards and methods of writing assessment, they open up possibilities to reflect upon their own and their students' politics and subjectivities, as well as explore methods for collaborative assessments. To guide readers, we offer some initial questions: How might writing teachers and students account for their own intersectional embodied subjectivities in collaborative writing assessment practices? What roles do the politics of judgement play in assessment ecologies where students collaborate with the teacher? More broadly speaking, how might writing teachers and students with antiracist goals navigate the complexities and tensions that arise through collaborative writing assessment practices?

Initially, we (Kristin and Asao) intended for this book to be a student-facing collection of chapters and activities that would help students practice meaningful writing assessment that focused on social justice goals and outcomes. For us, this meant assessment that has tangible value in a course, that cultivates student agency, that challenges standard language ideology, and invites critique of and deliberation about all expectations used to judge writing in classrooms. Meaningful writing assessment, in our minds, is collaborative, and engages deeply with the racial and other politics of language, a range of different expectations, and the varying habits of language that always exist in any group of people. And this means that good writing assessment in classrooms also engages with the intersectional subjectivities in those ecologies.

We wanted a collection of voices that would offer writing students and teachers critical practices and insights into antiracist and other social justice language work that good collaborative assessment in classrooms affords. As proposals and chapter drafts came in, our understanding of what the collection could be evolved. And so we leaned into what we got. Regretfully, the collection moved away from students as its primary audience and toward teachers. It shifted from mostly practical to part practical and part reflective.

Early drafts of chapter submissions reinforced our belief that we teachers *must* be able to reflect on our embodied subject positionings in meaningful, nuanced ways if we are going to do antiracist assessment with students. That is, we embody our languaging,[1] as well as the judgements[2] we make through that languaging as teachers, in a number of ways that affect students' experiences in our courses. This is especially important when discussing our pedagogies. If we can't name our subjectivities in racialized, gendered, and other meaningful social and political ways, then how can we recognize the full extent of what our pedagogies do, or the ways our students can do that work with us? How can we be antiracist if we cannot name the ways our embodied languaging is socially implicated in our expectations and acts of judgement?

Five of our fourteen contributors are teachers of color. Ten are women, and four of those contributors are women of color. These numbers are likely a function of the Whiteness of the discipline of writing studies and writing assessment rhetoric, as well as of who teaches writing courses in U.S. colleges and universities today. Or perhaps these numbers suggest who in our discipline is interested, willing, or feel they can speak to (safely) the topics of this collection. But such demographics of our contributors illustrate other patterns that may be more pervasive in writing classrooms and the discipline of rhetoric and composition, patterns we want to make more salient to readers.

As our contributors revised their chapters, we realized how difficult it is for many White teachers to engage with their own racialized subjectivities in relation to their teaching and assessment practices beyond referencing those subjectivities. Most of the teacher-scholars in this collection had a hard time implicating their Whiteness in their assessment work, or found it difficult to make sense of the racialized power relations that determine assessment practices and their outcomes. This difficulty, combined with the vital insights contributors had about their classes as they dug deeper into this reflective work, led us to change our intended audience and purpose for the collection. This collection is intended for writing teachers who are looking to understand the relationship between their

---

1.   We use the term "languaging" in the same ways that Inoue has in other places (Inoue, 2021). The statement, "Toward Antiracist First-Year Composition Goals" offers a good definition of the term: "'Languaging' refers to the understanding of language as an embodied set of linguistic, performative, and material habits and behaviors that often are called 'writing,' 'speaking,' or 'communicating.' The statement uses this term, 'language,' because it is broader and linked to a wide array of embodied practices that are also connected to the ways humans enact and know ourselves. Languaging also increasingly includes digital technologies" (Beavers et al., 2021, p. 2).

2.   In this Introduction, we use the spelling "judgement," with the "e" left in the term, for the reasons Asao has detailed in another place (Inoue, 2021). In short, this spelling that preserves the "e" in the noun, judgement, calls attention to the judge (person) who judges (action) in judgement. Judgements are never abstract, nor completely separate from judges who make them. Judgements are always a function of embodied actions by people.

own racialized subjectivities and their antiracist assessment work with students, who themselves embody intersectional subjectivities.

We saw great need for developing this kind of reflective analysis in the multiple drafts of chapters we received. We also saw value in offering examples of language teachers reflecting on collaborative classroom assessments while foregrounding their embodied subject positionings. At the same time, we realized that our field (writing studies and writing assessment) lacks robust analytical, reflective tools for teachers to do that work in collaborative assessment ecologies. Moreover, few antiracist approaches to writing assessment go beyond collaborative rubric creation. Rubrics, while important, are just one part of a much larger assessment ecology.

As we were asking contributors to develop their chapters with an attention to their own subjectivities, Whitney Lew James, one of our original contributors who had to withdraw from the collection, raised vital questions about requiring teachers of color to address their positionality for a field of mostly White readers. On February 21, 2021, she wrote in an email to us:

> As a person of color, I wonder when discussing my positionality becomes performing for White audiences? Indeed, while White people often need to be reminded of their positionality, people of color do not. . . . In the many, many workshops of positionality and teaching that I've attended, people of color and other marginalized individuals are often asked to relive some of the most traumatizing experiences of their lives or to recount the daily and weekly reminders of their precarity to a room full of White people . . . so that White people can learn about oppression. What advice would you give specifically to writers of color contributing to this collection? How do you want us to address our positionality without performing it for White audiences? . . . My thoughts on your call for more directly addressing positionality in my chapter are tied up with many other requests—or demands—to interrogate my positionality, often framed with White people as the primary audience for and benefactors of such interrogations.

James raises important questions about the harmful performative nature of discussing one's positionality, particularly for BIPOC writers and teachers. We wrestled with this paradox. On the one hand, it's unfair to ask teachers of color to disclose something that may subject them to yet more risk or trauma. On the other hand, it may very well be vital to the larger cause of antiracist teaching, assessing, and academic work, vital to mentoring and guiding those who come after us. That is, the very reflective act of understanding one's positionality in front of others can be both savagely harmful and deeply helpful in our work with students, depending on who you are, where you come from, and what your relation to educational institutions and the people in them have been.

And yet, the nature of the performance is also important to this dynamic of harm and help. We certainly do not advocate for BIPOC teachers to rehearse trauma they cannot hold or reveal, at least at this moment, through such subjectivity performances in collections like this. We also know that social justice work is not fair. It is not evenly distributed. It has uneven effects on various people who are racially embodied in a range of ways. It is not even in the lifts each of us must take on, and it's often uncomfortable work. There is no easy answer to this paradox, except perhaps that we must all be as brave as we can and as compassionate as possible with ourselves and each other. We must listen on others' terms, like James'. The truth is, we aren't sure how to do this work without being honest and open about our positionality in the classroom. We don't know a way out except through, as painful and unfair and uneven as that is for BIPOC teachers next to our White colleagues. It's the compassionate thing to do, which means we cannot expect everyone else to follow suit, even as we are confident that it is the best response.

Despite the inevitability that there's some measure of risk for contributors just in engaging in this work, we hoped that being published as part of a *collection* of voices might help to mitigate any risks for contributors in precarious positions. We also tried to mitigate those risks with our own voices as editors of this collection. We tried to do in our chapters what we asked of our contributors. Further, although the reality is that most readers will probably be White, we tried to push back against that assumption, encouraging contributors of color to center BIPOC academic readers in their chapters. While this collection by no means transcends the very real inequities that James identifies, we hope that it provides solidarity for the many teacher-scholars in precarious positions working bravely to transform themselves and their working contexts. We offer this collection as one way to help fellow teachers reflect on how our own and our students' embodied subject positions impact the always-embodied antiracist work we *can* do through our assessment ecologies.

Why Writing Teachers Need to Examine Their Racialized and Embodied Subject Positions

The difficulties of reflecting on our embodied subjectivities that we found when working with our contributors appears to be a product of the field of writing studies and writing teachers more generally. This problem creates a purpose or need for this collection beyond, of course, hearing from teachers on their experiences with enacting collaborative antiracist writing assessments. Thus, the title of this section is really an imperative for all writing teachers, one tied to the antiracist work that this collection centers on. We don't feel we need to make the argument that either collaborative assessment or antiracist assessment practices more generally should be considered and reflected upon by teachers and students. We all know the importance of that work. We also think that when collaborative

antiracist assessments are a part of our writing courses, writing teachers should consider carefully the influence and effects of their own embodied subject positions and those of their students when they take stock in what happened and how well things worked out. Were their collaborative antiracist assessment practices meaningful or effective? If so (or if not), what role did the bodies in the course play? How did the teachers' and students' embodiments affect assessment? Having answers to these kinds of questions can help us understand how replicable our antiracist assessment practices can be.

We should say that we know that many writing teachers do this work already, or have little choice in doing it, as they are confronted with the ways their bodies and their embodiments in their teaching exist and function outside of often expected elite, White, masculine, able bodied, heterosexual, and neurotypical norms. For years, Black feminist scholars in composition have discussed the ways racialized, gendered, and classed embodiment affects their teaching. For instance, in 2003, Simone A. James Alexander offers a compelling account of the ways that her Black, Caribbean-born (Guyanese), middle-class, female body, who is multilingual, affects the ways she engages in discussions of race in her writing classrooms. Her racialized and gendered embodiment also are read by her mostly White students in ways that affect her "authoritative presence" to them (2003, p. 106). She explains that "[t]he subject of classroom debates [on race] can become the object of her students' gaze" (pp. 106-107). That is, she becomes the racialized and gendered object of her students' gaze. Illustrating this tension through an exchange with a White male student in her class who claimed that White people often are afraid to take blood from Black people because of sickle cell anemia, Alexander cites the Black female academic, Carla Peterson: "the 'body is never simply matter, for it is never divorced from perception and interpretation . . . and it is subject to examination and speculation' . . . My body is always already a 'highly contested site of meaning'" (2003, p. 108). If our bodies are always highly contested sites of meaning, then they must be accounted for in the central meaning-making processes of any writing course, that is our assessment processes. Our assessments are often how meaning is contested in classrooms between teachers and students, as well as students and students, or students and texts.

Thus we can always use more guidance and models for such hard and brave work, especially work that intersects with collaborative antiracist writing assessment work. So, for the purposes of understanding the need for this collection, we ask: In what ways do writing teachers take into account the various bodies in the course and the ways those people are embodied when they design, enact, or reflect upon their collaborative antiracist assessment work with students? While we do not intend for racialized embodiment to be the center of the collection, we do think it is central to a lot of what we can do, or reflect upon, in our classrooms' assessment ecologies.

Even without an antiracist orientation or goal for our assessments, most writing teachers use collaborative activities that engage students together and with

the teacher to accomplish the goals of the course. We believe that these practices too require an understanding of how the bodies and embodiments of teachers and students make their classroom ecologies antiracist in orientation or not. But when we look at collaborative antiracist writing assessment, as the contributors do in this collection, important issues of racialized embodied subject positionings become more obvious, and perhaps more salient and open for understanding more generally. This is not intuitive nor easy work. We don't even think that all of the chapters here accomplish everything they might along these lines, but each one does attempt in significant ways this work.

Why is this kind of reflective work so difficult for writing teachers, teachers who are arguably the best positioned to do it? Despite the good work of Black and White feminist scholars from at least the early 2000s, it isn't clear that the field of composition studies has done enough to help teachers investigate their own bodies and embodiments in their assessments and pedagogies. We just don't have enough practice at it. Or maybe, we just have not taken up this challenge consistently enough, offered enough models, and made it a deep part of how we all get trained and do our teaching work.

In 2015, drawing on Michelle Payne's discussion of the failures of her own writing pedagogies because of her own female body and issues of authority in her classrooms in the early 1990s, Leslie Erin Bartlett made the argument that "the scholarship had not yet accounted for the profound difference the teacher's body makes as part of the rhetorical context in which teachers teach" (p. 47). Similarly, Shari Stenberg offered one early attempt (2002) to account for bodies in writing classrooms in "Embodied Classrooms, Embodied Knowledges: Re-Thinking the Mind/Body Split." Stenberg argued that we too often "deny embodiment in scholarly and pedagogical sites, and the related tendency to conflate disembodiment with authority and freedom" (2002, p. 44). To translate for our discussion's purposes, we not only avoid or ignore the ways our embodiments mediate our classroom assessment ecologies, but we also conflate the ways we avoid our embodiments in our assessment practices with authoritative assessment or authoritative judgement practices. Let's put that another way: When it seems our bodies are not there, we think our assessments are fair. To appear to be bodiless often is assumed to equate to neutrality, objectivity, and authority. These attributes, when attached to judgements or judges, are usually assumed to be the definition of fairness. But these are also habits of White language that participate in White language supremacy (Inoue, 2021). Our collection's chapters suggest that bodiless judgement is simply not a reality, nor is it attainable, or even worth striving for in human languaging interactions.

Performance studies is one way that scholars and teachers have attempted to explain the subject positioning of the writing teacher. The slow turn toward performance in the field of composition studies that Bartlett explains can be seen at least as far back as Lad Tobin's work in the 1990s. Such orientations in scholarship ramped up in the early to mid-2000s (Bartlett, 2015). Important to note in

this scholarship, as Bartlett observes, is that the language that described teachers went "from *being* to *doing*" (2015, p. 43). What Bartlett suggests is that discussions of the ways teachers were embodied as subjects in the classroom became more about what they did or what they couldn't do. This makes sense, as much of the field of composition studies is focused on pedagogy, which tends to be about what teachers do (or don't do) in the classroom.

In many important ways, we are what we do. Bartlett argues that writing teachers might learn a lot from understanding the ways they are embodied in the classroom by focusing on performance theories. That is, one way to read Bartlett's discussion is as one that asks us to consider the subject of the teacher in terms of that body's performance of "the appropriate" and/or "the possible" writing teacher (2015, p. 42). She argues that "careful attention to pedagogical performance has the potential for liberatory effects for both teachers and students," and understanding pedagogy as performance "invites . . . a wider range of available performances for teachers and students" (2015, p. 41). This wider range of teaching performances occurs when we understand the difference between the possible and the appropriate in our writing and in our teaching. As many of the following chapters illustrate, we wonder, how *possible* are our collaborative antiracist assessments? To pose this question another way, we might ask: How *inappropriate* can our antiracist assessments be?

While Bartlett is not explicitly defining or thinking about embodiment as a construct, she tacitly draws on such discussions by focusing on performance as important to who the teacher is or can be. However, we are much more than what we do in front of our students. And different bodies do things differently, or are perceived so, thus they are experienced in a wide range of ways, as Bartlett's discussion of Payne illustrates. Our bodies, their affordances and limitations, their shapes and styles, their sounds and silences, are important to what we do and how that doing is experienced by the doer and understood by those around them.

In their concept statement on embodiment from feminist traditions, Maureen Johnson and colleagues ask: "what if we could *recontextualize* bodies and experience the physical body as an entity with its own rhetorical agency?" (2015, p. 39). What we hear in their question is a kind of separation for reflection's sake in classrooms that practice collaborative assessment ecologies with students. That is, the body having its own rhetorical agency, perhaps as something separate from the agency we tend to locate in people as agents who make decisions and do things through intention and will, may offer teachers a way to understand their own embodied subjectivities and the ways those subjectivities are understood by students. This includes making sense of the various unintended consequences or outcomes in their assessment ecologies and pedagogies. Considering our bodies as having agency may help some make sense of their antiracist pedagogies when it appears things go wrong, or when students don't act "appropriately" or in expected ways, or when a person, their words and actions, are read in ways unexpected. This happens a lot in the chapters—just about every one of them. How do

we see the potential, as Bartlett claims, in our collaborative antiracist work when it seems the bodies around us do not "get" what we hoped they might, or do not perform in the ways we think they should?

One possibility that we offer to readers, and that we offered to the contributors of this collection as they revised their drafts, is to ruminate on their body and its politicized subject positioning in the classroom next to other bodies and positionings. We felt that doing this could help our contributors consider the limits and affordances of their own particular antiracist collaborative assessment ecologies in their places with the students in front of them. What kind of agency in antiracist assessment work does a White female teacher's body have, a body that is also in some chronic pain? How is that body experienced by students? What about the agency and choices for a Black female teacher's body, one that is able bodied? Again, Johnson et al. provide a way to begin this line of reflecting by defining the body itself. They say:

> the physical body carries meaning through discourse about or by a body. But embodiment theories suggest that meaning can be articulated beyond language. *All bodies* do rhetoric through texture, shape, color, consistency, movement, and function. Embodiment encourages a methodological approach that addresses the reflexive acknowledgement of the researcher from feminist traditions and conveys an awareness or consciousness about how bodies—our own and others'—figure in our work. Just as considerations of our positions as researchers are critical to understanding our individual and collective commitments to arguments about the role of bodies and rhetoric, our bodies inform our ways of knowing. (2015, p. 39)

It isn't hard to hear in their words that our bodies not only "inform our ways of knowing" but also circumscribe the ways we design, teach, and judge in classrooms. Our bodies are a critical component to any assessment ecology, particularly when those ecologies are collaborative in nature, when they call our students to do assessment with us. In other words, to consider the ways we are embodied in our antiracist assessment work in classrooms is to understand that such assessment work is embodied body-work. This adds some complexity to questions about how a White, able-bodied, heteronormative, male teacher, for instance, can do collaborative antiracist assessment. This is not a rhetorical question. It's posing the embodied body-work problem that antiracist assessment presents to any one of us.

Johnson et al. also argue that the material body carries both "rhetorical power" and "signifying power" through its various cultural, gendered, social, linguistic and racial affiliations (2015, p. 40). For these scholars, this also means an "ethical reading of bodies . . . [is a] recognition of bodies as *people*—not objects" in the rhetorical work we do (2015, p. 40). For the purposes of this collection, we add to this idea that our reflective and pedagogical work as teachers requires us to

ethically read our bodies as people, which includes ethically reading our students' bodies as people too. This is not just reading our students in a fully humane way. That, of course, is important.

What we hear in Johnson et al.'s claim to read bodies as people is to read bodies as people who are more complex in a number of ways. They explain that "[j]ust as we call for *bodies* to be seen for their multiplicity as conglomerates of intricate layers, forces, and parts, so too should we experience *rhetorics*. Both are assemblers of and assembled by their orientations to larger cultural forces" (2015, p. 42). This layered connection between a body and the rhetorics circulating around it that both make it and are made by it, is one that can be meaningful for teachers and students. It has bearing on antiracist writing assessment ecologies. If assessment is anything, it is rhetorical work, the kind that Johnson et al. connect to "intricate layers, forces, and parts" that compose bodies. One way to hear their call to read bodies as people, then, is to hear that the judgements we circulate, which usually are our words, our languaging, our rhetoric, call upon "larger cultural forces" to "assemble" the bodies of our students, perhaps first in the draft, but that always fingers out to the material body of the student. We never (are never perceived to) simply judge students' words. If judging is part of the larger cultural forces and rhetorics around us, then it too assembles our embodiments in classrooms.

One important aspect of bodies, and therefore important to the ways we are embodied in classrooms, is our skin. While ambiguous and never clear about what it means, our skin is one of the most obvious and noticeable features of most people. Feminist theorists have asked us to consider our skin as more than simply the outermost part of our bodies, or where our bodies end or begin. They urge us to ask: Are our bodies contained by our epidermis, thus is our embodiment circumscribed by skin? Donna Haraway talks about our skin as a kind of boundary, but asks "[w]hy should our bodies end at the skin" (1991, p. 178)? Sara Ahmed and Jackie Stacey call skin "the fleshy interface between bodies and worlds," and they argue for a politics that "thinks through the skin" (2001, p. 1). They explain this idea:

> *Thinking Through the Skin* poses the question of how skin becomes, rather than simply is, meaningful. To ask such a question is to suggest that the skin is always open to being read. If the skin is always open to being read (and being read differently), we can also consider the ways in which these various techniques for reading produce skins in specific and determinate ways. (2001, p. 1)

What we hear in Ahmed and Stacey's explanation of "thinking through the skin" is a racialized reading process that accounts for skin. All reading processes are judgement processes. If our skin is "always open to being read (and being read differently)," and such reading processes "produce skin in specific and determinate

ways," then skin-producing processes are also assessment processes, and vice versa. Ahmed and Stacey ask: "How does the skin come to be written and narrated? How is the skin managed by subjects, others and nations" (2001, p. 2)? Such questions are ones about judgement and decisions. They are questions about the nature of assessments. Assessments make decisions and knowledge. Through our assessments, through the various ways we enact judgement in a classroom, skin "becomes . . . meaningful" through our acts of reading and languaging about it in that classroom. How do our judgements, then, in such places become antiracist readings of skin? How are our skin-producing processes of assessment explicitly antiracist in orientation? Can skin, as one layer of embodiment, *become* antiracist?

While a body's skin suggests separation from other bodies, this too is not so clear in classrooms. The boundaries between bodies and contexts are more permeable than we may initially realize. One thing that assessment as ecology has shown us is that we are all interconnected (Inoue, 2015), that what we do, who we are, and where we are, are all aspects of the same question. In other words, we might also consider the ways our various embodiments in the classroom signal ways we are all interconnected, bound to each other through our shared purposes, desires, and the places we commune.

Abby Knoblauch and Marie Moeller illustrate the ways our bodies are interconnected by explaining how the body, and embodiment, are much more fluid and complex than typically thought of (2022). They discuss Brennen's *The Transmission of Affect* that refers to the changes in body chemistry through merely entering a room (2022); Elizabeth Wilson's *Gut Feminism* that discusses the ways in which the human gut is literally an "organ of the mind" (2015, pp. 4-5); and Margaret Price's "*bodymind*" that is "a sociopolitically constituted and material entity that emerges through both structural (power-and violence-laden) contexts and also individual (specific) experience" (2015, p. 271; as cited in Knoblauch & Moeller, 2022, p. 5). And as we might expect, Knoblauch and Moeller's discussion tacitly turns to assessment and judgement.

When explaining Gail Weiss' argument that any body is always framed in ways that are raced, classed, gendered, among other social frames, such as motherhood, they sum up Weiss' ideas: "These bodies are judged, controlled, mediated, medicated, incarcerated, all in unequal ways, as those in power react/respond to the physical characteristics of the specific and culturally coded body itself. Bodies are always judged in concert with contexts" (2022, p. 5). Bodies are never read as just a body. They are read as Alexander says as "highly contested sites" (2003, p. 108), but those sites themselves are also in context. That is, our bodies are read next to other bodies and situated in particular places and times, all of which accumulate meaning associated with the body. And so, we are interconnected not just with each other but with our environments and through the ways we are judged or made through judgement.

Citing Eleanor Rosch, Knoblauch and Moeller remind us that "the body" is not the same as "embodiment" (Rosch, p. xxxvi; as cited in Knoblauch & Moeller,

2022, p. 7). Drawing on a range of feminist theorists, Knoblauch and Moeller define embodiment as "the process of being a person in a body" (2022, p. 7). And so, embodiment, at least for Knoblauch and Moeller, is a collection of processes that happen through time and space in places with other bodies. They nuance this, however, using Elizabeth Grosz' idea that embodiment is a phenomenon in which a person "lives the body," and not simply "lives in a body" (2022, p. 7). Our bodies make our living not just possible but make it. Living doesn't happen without a body. They further suggest that "the space between body and embodying seems to hinge, at least in part, on motion" (2022, p. 7). This is not simply a reference to performance theory. Our bodies move, even at rest, meaning that "air and blood circulate, bacteria mill about, autonomic reflexes twitch—the body moves without conscious effort, but not without bodily effort" (2022, p. 7).

To avoid the ableist framing of embodiment as mostly motion, they draw on Gail Weiss again, explaining that embodiment is not "private," rather it is "always already mediated by our continual interactions with other human and nonhuman bodies" (2022, p. 8). This means our embodiments are not just the motions our bodies engage in. They are also connected to, and mediated by, the world and people around us. Ironically, this interconnection signals various ways our embodiments make up differences in the world. To be embodied means that our body is "mediated by," our contexts and "interactions with other human and non-human bodies" around us (Knoblauch & Moeller, 2022, p. 8). Such mediated contexts and interactions make present differences between bodies. One is different from other bodies only in so much as that person's body embodies difference in ways mediated by those around the body of difference in contexts that make such a body among other bodies different. We know. It sounds circular. Embodied differences are understood by perceived markers of racial, cultural, linguistic, and other social characteristics that circulate not simply around bodies but in narratives that have messages about such bodily markers and bodies.

One mediated aspect of our embodiments in our courses with students are the texts that we offer students, the assignments and feedback that we initiate and circulate, as well as the requirements of texts to be assessed—that is, the requirements that make the conditions under which any assessment can happen at all. This is typically things like assignment guidelines, due dates or methods of turning in work, but it could also be rubrics, or something as simple as what font or line spacing requirements a teacher imposes on students. These elements make up a part of one's embodiment in writing assessments, and show up in several chapters in this collection.

Vyshali Manivannan offers insight into how such seemingly superficial elements of a course's assessment ecology can be harmful, ableist, and racist. She describes herself as a BIPOC writer and scholar who has "written and published for several years with fibromyalgia, an incurable, nonprogressive chronic pain condition characterized by widespread pain, heightened pain sensitivity, affective dysfunction, and fatigue" (2022, p. 183). Drawing on Price's idea of "bodymind,"

Manivannan argues that the textual requirements of scholarly publication and other academic texts creates "eugenic" conditions for people embodied like her, "reproducing the illusion of homogeneous (able-bodyminded) academic writers with Western/rationalist notions of legitimate expertise" (2022, p. 184). Furthermore, Manivannan explains that

> Academic knowledge making, from drafting to publication, vanishes the epistemology and ontology of the chronically pained body, cultivating ableist genre conventions like linearity and clinical language, denying chronically pained authors a presence in scholarship. The able body is represented in scholarly craft as the able mind, while the pained subject, to readers and to academic culture, is a liability. (2022, p. 185-186)

The way texts and fonts are formatted, she explains, "operate to maintain and administer the dominance of Western epistemology" (2022, p. 188). Quoting Ames Hawkins' discussion of the Times New Roman font, Manivannan says that such serif fonts have "created a visual frame for the legacy of masculine, colonialist, 'civilized' (i.e., not unruly) epistemology, conveying authority, clarity, objective truth, and dispassionate distance" (2022, p. 188). Thus there may be ways in our assessment ecologies in which we erase those students embodied in disabled or dis-eased ways through our textual requirements, or by ignoring our own pain in composing texts for our students, giving them only clean, Times New Roman drafts. Echoing Grosz and Weiss, Manivannan draws on disability theory, explaining further: "How you choose to read says a lot about your politics of knowledge" (2022, p. 189). We add that the textual requirements that make our assessments possible also assemble the bodies of our students, embody them. If our requirements are too strict, this may lead to some students being unable to be embodied, or dis-embodied, or outside of what it means to be embodied in the work we ask of students.

What Manivannan reveals to us is that our embodiments can often be imposed on students unknowingly in ways we do not fully realize or want. The "basic requirements" of an assignment, or the ways we present our own judgements to students, can erase some students' embodiments or impose a way of being in the world that is ill-fitting to some. Students may not always know how to respond to such requirements, except to blame themselves for not being able to meet them. While no chapters take this concern up at any length, we hear it underneath some discussions, or perhaps behind the words. We don't mean to read what isn't there, or may not be there, rather we see this kind of reading of the chapters in light of Stenberg's ideas around possible performances (as opposed to appropriate ones). We read into such absences or silences as a way to perform a *meaningful possible reading*, one that explores potential meanings and lessons from the embodied reflections the contributors can offer at this moment of publication.

To close this section, we turn to a classroom, Stenberg's. While we don't offer her discussion as "the way" to investigate with students the ways and implications

of our embodied subjectivities, we find Stenberg's return to her own writing classroom instructive in a few ways. Her discussion glosses the work of this collection in how it tacitly references the assessment ecologies she and her students participate in, without ever discussing assessment outright. Further, it suggests how important the embodiments of herself and her students are to those ecologies and their mutual work together. Stenberg reflects:

> As I write this, I am working to integrate questions of specific, embodied identity into my first-year composition course, to create moments when we consider how we read bodies as signs, how we learn our own embodied identities, and how our readings of the world and each other are dependent upon our own embodied lens. I have, for instance, designed an assignment in which students study a medium (cable channel, magazine, radio station, college catalogs) targeted at some aspect of their identities, to examine how it constructs an identity for them—teaching them to "be" a particular way—as well as to consider how they resist and accede to that identity. I want them to examine the role culture plays in schooling them as embodied subjects, teaching them who to be and how to understand themselves. And I want us to imagine ways of intervening in this cultural inscription. But I don't want to approach identity or the body as merely discursive, as if we are all equally entitled to re-write ourselves at will. Cultural structures "limit" some bodies more than others, teaching us that we must deny certain aspects of our identity if we want to embrace another. Nor do I want to pretend that we exist apart from readers, who bring their own sets of assumptions to each textual interaction. (2002, p. 57)

Stenberg could easily be describing an antiracist assessment ecology, its aims and goals, one that centers on the relationship between students' embodied subjectivities and judgements that circulate around them in cultural texts and practices. Like all the chapters in this collection in some way, we also hear in Stenberg's reflection an important question for all teachers and students: How do our collaborative antiracist assessment ecologies construct the identities of our students, "teaching them to 'be' a particular way"? In what ways do our assessments teach our students "to be and understand themselves" in certain ways? What these questions point to is the power that assessment has in shaping students in racialized, gendered, classed, neurotypical, or able-bodied ways because our cognitive and linguistic expectations, our standards and processes of assessment, and our instructions to students are all necessarily tied to our embodiments in the classroom. Our assessments make embodied languagelings. We might even say they make the ways we all become embodied as languagelings in the world. Is that too bold? Perhaps, but we believe that writing teachers play an important role in such embodied subject shaping.

The bottom line: Our politicized embodiments as teachers and students affect our assessment ecologies, which include their products, or the intended and unintended outcomes. Our embodied subjectivities affect how we and our students act and interact in any assessment ecology. But what opportunities have we taken as writing teachers to notice, collect information, and reflect upon the complicated ways our embodiments and those of our students are made by and influence the collaborative work we do with them? While our collection may not always fully address such important questions, the chapters can be read in ways that suggest responses and perhaps suggest important work reader-teachers might do in their own collaborative antiracist work with students.

Some Important Definitions

Several chapters in this collection use different terms for similar things. We didn't want to make uniform all the references to things like "historically White universities" or "predominantly White institutions," so we didn't ask authors to change many of their terms. We felt that maintaining the diversity in the ways authors represent ideas and other things was important for the collection. This preserves deeply contextual terms and ways of knowing. We also wanted to honor the different languaging that comes from different kinds of embodied teachers in different contexts. So there will be references in chapters that point to similar or the same things that other chapters call something else. We accept this ambiguity as an important part of how languaging works among diverse languagelings who work in different places.

While most chapters contextualize and define their own uses of particular terms that are important to this collection and its call, we still wish to offer our explanations of a few recurring terms. We offer some discussion of these shared terms below that we think will help many readers along the way. While not all chapters work from the same understandings of these terms, we feel our understanding of them here offers readers a way to read those references when they appear.

Assessment ecologies. This term references a theoretical framework for classroom assessment discussed in Asao's previous book, *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing for A Socially Just Future* (2015). All writing courses have assessment ecologies, often numerous ones, from the larger ecology that produces course grades or learning that students walk away with to smaller ecologies that form the languaging around an essay or another assignment. All assessment ecologies are complex systems that are "more than" the sum of what constitutes them (Inoue, 2015, p. 86). This means that to enact antiracist assessment in a course, you cannot just plug-and-play a practice or a rubric or some other process that in another complex system appears to be antiracist in its outcomes. Assessment ecologies also are interconnected, with elements at times sharing properties of each other or morphing into other elements (Inoue, 2015).

For instance, a rubric may start as something in the ecology that represents writing expectations, but later in the process of peer review becomes a heuristic that makes a process of response, so it may form reading processes or even learning outcomes, that is, products of the ecology.

Assessment ecologies have at least seven elements that constitute them and that can be mapped and designed explicitly (see Inoue, 2015, p. 176 for a representation of the seven elements of assessment ecologies). The seven elements of any assessment ecology, antiracist or otherwise, are listed below with questions that help explain what each element identifies about the assessment ecology:

- **Purposes** – What is the purpose or goal of the assessment? Why is this assessment happening, or what are the reasons or goals for assessment?
- **Processes** – What processes are used to do assessment? How are judgements accomplished, and what happens with them? What steps or actions are taken?
- **Parts** – What are the main or significant parts of the assessment ecology? What are the codes, scripts, constructs, and artifacts used and produced?
- **Places** – What are the places created in the ecology and the people made in those places? What material and figurative sites are created that affect, organize, and influence people in the ecology?
- **People** – Who is involved in judging, and what are their embodied language and other capacities? Where do these capacities come from in each case? How are people made by the places of assessment?
- **Products** – What are the learning products of the ecology? What indirect and direct consequences are produced or expected from what happens and from the judgements that circulate around any products students produce? What are the expected and unexpected organic outcomes of assessment?
- **Power** – How does power circulate in the ecology? In what ways are disciplining, control, and norming (to some standard) enacted? How do power, hierarchies, and control circulate?

In our working with authors on their chapters, we assumed an assessment ecology framework, so the biases of this framework often show up in their discussions; however, most of the chapters do not explicitly use this framework to discuss their assessments. Many gesture to it. But we still believe that the framework is useful for readers to use as heuristic, or a reflective device when considering what the chapters offer.

Habits of White language (HOWL). Over the last decade or so, Asao has offered various articulations of what he now terms HOWL, but the concept began as "White *habitus*" or "White discourse" (Inoue, 2015, pp. 47-49; 2019, pp. 399-400; 2021, pp. 22-28). This term came from two places: Pierre Bourdieu and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. Asao first articulated this idea as an "epistemology of racism" in his dissertation at Washington State University. To do this, he used Bourdieu's

idea of *habitus* and other rhetorical and Marxian ideas about common sense in practices, policies, and institutions. Asao argued that together, *habitus* and common sense form an epistemology of racism (Inoue, 2005) that is historical in nature and both inside of us and outside of us. Whiteness is central to both sides of this dialectic. Flash forward almost ten years and Asao was using "White *habitus*" in his first-year writing courses with students. By 2019, he rested on "habits of White language," or HOWL, since this term was more understandable and useful for students.

It should be emphasized that HOWL is more than simply habits or markers in a text or speech act that elite, masculine, heteronormative, able bodied, White(ly) people have historically controlled and dictated through English language instruction in the US. The "habits" in the term is Bourdieu's *habitus*. This means that HOWL is both inside of us and outside of us, marked on us and performed by us. It is discursive and material. It is a deep part of academic and "professional" embodiment. It is also structurally determined in many ways around us, yet we still have agency to language and judge through language in particular ways or directions. That is, HOWL references both the languageling who does language as an agent making idiosyncratic decisions, and a range of material structures, or a range of language practices, policies, and institutions that form our historical languaging conditions. These conditions are structures that provide the languageling with both boundaries, or limits, and pressure in particular hegemonic directions. This language theorizing is really Marxian determination (see Williams, 1977, p. 87).

As Bourdieu defines it, *habitus* is a set of ingrained and habitual dispositions and structures that tacitly make us who we are. They are structural and everyday, working on us and marking us, making us as we make them. This means that elite forms of heteronormative, masculine Whiteness are central to any dominant set of language habits we expect in classrooms or boardrooms. This is the historical politics of the English language. Bourdieu, however, does not inflect his concept explicitly with race. His concept is mostly about class, and he explains the idea this way:

> systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. (1977, p. 72)

As we hope you can hear in Bourdieu's account of *habitus*, the structuring structures, the durable dispositions that are marked on our bodies and words, are systems both in and around us that share in multiple social and historical dimensions of people.

Bonilla-Silva's use of "White *habitus*" also draws on Bourdieu's term. In his study of how White people talk about race, Bonilla-Silva explains White *habitus*

as, "a racialized, uninterrupted socialization process that *conditions* and *creates* Whites' racial taste, perceptions, feelings, and emotions and their views on racial matters" (2003/2018, p. 121). Thus HOWL is more than a description of the common ways an elite White dominant society has done English languaging. It is also itself a set of structures that are a part of everyone's conditions, making us as we make those structures, so much so that it is difficult to see HOWL as anything other than neutral language expectations or standards. This makes them a deep part of all assessment ecologies and writing teachers' embodied subjectivities, regardless of how those teachers identify themselves. These habits often seem like just how anyone would communicate effectively and consistently. But this ignores the *habitus* in the habits. It ignores the history and normative nature of elite, White, masculine, heteronormative, ableist dominance in societies, schools, and academic disciplines.

HOWL boils down to the following heuristic, which references six habits of language often found in some combination in dominant English languaging that usually comes out of elite, White, heteronomative, ableist, masculine language groups.[3]

- Unseen, Naturalized Orientation to the World
- Hyperindividualism
- Stance of Neutrality, Objectivity, and Apoliticality
- Individualized, Rational, Controlled Self
- Rule-Governed, Contractual Relationships
- Clarity, Order, and Control

You may note the ways we (the editors of this collection) as well as the chapter authors participate in HOWL. This is not a mark of White language supremacy or racism. It is an indication that we've been indoctrinated into racist and White language supremacist systems. Most of us do not get to avoid HOWL completely. But as the next term identifies, our degree of participation in White language supremacy hinges on how our HOWLing circulates in the ecologies in which it is present.

White language supremacy (WLS). Asao first used "White language supremacy" in his 2019 Chair's Address for the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in Pittsburgh (2019), but he didn't clearly define it in that talk. During his tenure as the chair of that organization, Asao tasked a group of CCCC members to research and draft a CCCC statement on White language

---

3.   You can find a handout that offers a fuller description of HOWL, with references, in a g'doc that Asao created and uses with students and teachers (https://tinyurl.com/HOWLhandout6). For a discussion of HOWL on his blog, see Asao B. Inoue, "Blogbook – The Habits of White Language," Infrequent Words, website and blog. (2021, July 3), accessed at https://asaobinoue.blogspot.com/2021/07/blogbook-habits-of-white-language-howl.html.

supremacy, which was completed and published in June 2021. In October of 2021, Asao published a discussion and definition of the term in *Above the Well: An Antiracist Argument from a Boy of Color*. In the book, Asao explains the term as:

> The condition in classrooms, schools, and society where rewards are given in determined ways to people who can most easily reach them, because those people have more access to the preferred embodied White language habits and practices. These White language habits are so because they historically have come from White racial groups in the US who have had the power to make such standards and enforce them in schools, civic spaces, governments, and businesses. Part of the conditions of White language supremacy is an assumption in most systems that what is reachable at a given moment for the normative, White, middle- and upper-class, monolingual English user is reachable for all. (Inoue, 2021, p. 15)

For Asao, WLS always draws from HOWL, but the first habit, an "unseen naturalized orientation to the world," is central and necessary to WLS. Its presence in an assessment ecology creates a particular kind of circulation, one that is hierarchical in nature and tends to privilege elite, White, masculine, able bodied, neurotypical languagelings.

The habit of an unseen naturalized orientation to the world is taken from Sara Ahmed's article, "A Phenomenology of Whiteness," in which she draws from Edmund Husserl and Franz Fanon to explain the ways in which Whiteness is a starting point, an orientation in the world, one that also presumes a similar proximity to things, ideas, actions, and other phenomena in the world as a given and as reachable by all. Ahmed explains it this way:

> We inherit the reachability of some objects, those that are 'given' to us, or at least made available to us, within the 'what' that is around . . . Whiteness is an orientation that puts certain things within reach. By objects, we would include not just physical objects, but also styles, capacities, aspirations, techniques, habits. Race becomes, in this model, a question of what is within reach, what is available to perceive and to do "things" with. (Inoue, 2021, 154)

What might be heard in her description of Whiteness as an orientation is the way in which it is thoroughly embodied in nature. Some bodies may inherit this orientation even if they don't exercise it. Most importantly, while some habits within HOWL may be circulating in a writing classroom's assessment ecology, that ecology may not be participating in WLS if this first habit is not centrally operating as the way in which important decisions are made, such as grades. In the CCCC statement on WLS, the authors link WLS with White supremacy,

saying that WLS serves White supremacy more generally.[4] Drawing also on Eric Pritchard's work (2017), the statement explains that

> WLS assists White supremacy by using language to control reality and resources by defining and evaluating people, places, things, reading, writing, rhetoric, pedagogies, and processes in multiple ways that damage our students and our democracy. It imposes a worldview that is simultaneously pro-White, cisgender, male, heteronormative, patriarchal, ableist, racist, and capitalist. (Inoue, 2021, n.p.)

The authors also identify HOWL as a part of the structures that make WLS in classrooms and emphasize that the presence of the first habit is necessary, "always present," and "required" for WLS. They also emphasize the second habit in HOWL, hyperindividualism, as significant, particularly as it justifies colorblind logics and "the ideology of individualism as it works with meritocracy to disguise the role of language in racial capitalism and legitimize the failure of whole groups of BIPOC by pointing to exceptional individuals" (Conference on College Composition and Communication Contributors, 2021, n.p.).

What should be clear is that WLS does not identify bad teachers or bad people. It highlights the conditions and histories we live in and assess writing in. It helps us understand the White supremacist structures that need dismantling in our assessment ecologies and perhaps even ourselves. As the CCCC statement explains, these conditions, this White language supremacy, is intersectional in nature, having "pro-White, cisgender, male, heteronormative, patriarchal, ableist, racist, and capitalist" preferences, biases, and consequences, all of which are uneven (2021, n.p.). These conditions also suggest orientations that teachers and students might actively try to embody in order to oppose WLS. None of it is easy to do, nor even easy to figure out while a teacher is in the middle of a semester, or in a classroom discussion, or reading a student's paper. But with practice and awareness, we believe more writing teachers can meaningfully and sustainably work against WLS, and this is what we hear and see happening in the chapters in this collection.

The Ethical Use of Student Voices

Many of the chapters in this collection, such as our own, summarize or use recollected student voices, but do not necessarily quote students. Usually this is

---

4.   The authors of the CCCC Statement on White Language Supremacy" are listed in this order: Elaine Richardson, Asao Inoue, Denise Troutman, Qwo-Li Driskill, Bonnie Williams, Austin Jackson, Isabel Baca, Ana Celia Zentella, Victor Villanueva, Rashidah Muhammad, Kim B. Lovejoy, David F. Green, and Geneva Smitherman. The statement can be accessed on the NCTE/CCCC website.

because we do not have access to those students any longer to get their permission to use their exact words or names. So authors do not use those words in their chapters. If students did not wish to be represented, we made sure chapters honored those student requests too. But this is also a collection that examines teacher subjectivity and experiences, so the teachers' stories of students, if treated and offered ethically, are important to tell. Because of this, we worked hard to honor and respect the voices, words, and intentions that all of our students embody in different ways, ways oftentimes a teacher simply does not have access to. We also strive to help the teacher-authors of this collection offer their stories of students in ethical, respectful, honest, and compassionate ways.

We are aware of the ethical concerns around the use of student voices, particularly their words, intentions, or work that is produced for learning purposes in our courses, and not intended for scholarly discussion, such as this collection. As one of the reviewers of this collection reminded us, it is our ethical responsibility as scholars to make clear when ideas, words, and interactions of students represented in these chapters are the actual words and intentions voiced by our students and when a teacher-author is telling their version of such things, when what is offered is really a teacher's interpretation of their students' words and actions. When such summarizing of students' voices or intentions happen, we have asked authors to make as clear as they can that such observations are theirs, not necessarily the ideas, words, or intentions of their students.

Toward these ethics, we took that same reviewer's advice and tried to guide authors in their efforts to represent their students. In some cases, this meant prompting authors to reveal the evidence they have for their interpretations of students and their actions. It may also have meant a deeper reexamination of what the teacher-author was doing with their representations of students in their chapter. The bottom line is that we worked with all the contributors of this collection to faithfully respect the expressed wishes of our students, and ethically, respectfully, and compassionately represent our students, their ideas, and their actions.

The Chapters

The chapters collected here are organized in two sections: "Embodied Politics and Agency in Collaborative Spaces," and "Collaborative Anti-Oppressive Pedagogies." These groupings place the chapters in dialogue with each other, but there are also three larger themes that run through most of the chapters in both sections. We articulate these themes as questions that readers might ask themselves as they read all of the chapters in this collection. These larger themes are:

- What significance does a **teacher's embodied subjectivity** have in antiracist collaborative assessment practices with students?
- How do students and teachers in language classrooms manage or learn about the **politics of languaging**, which includes the politics of judgement?

- In what ways might **failure to accomplish** socially just or collaborative assessment in classrooms open up meaningfulness for teachers and students and perhaps still bring joy to the assessment ecology?

In the first section, chapters focus on the politics of race in collaborative writing assessment ecologies, with an attention to student and teacher agency and power relations. The second section turns to various anti-oppression assessment frameworks and orientations that come out of the teachers and classrooms discussed in the chapters. Part of our organizational strategy aims to counter the assumption of a White audience and the foregrounding of White teachers in our field. BIPOC scholars are leading antiracist work, and *thour*[5] voices, successes, constraints, and insights need to be amplified. So we put chapters by BIPOC scholars in prominent positions.

Part One: Embodied Politics and Agency in Collaborative Spaces

Although all the chapters in this book engage with the authors' racialized subjectivities, the chapters in this section do so as their primary purpose. Each chapter explores the challenges of doing collaborative assessment for the purposes of antiracism from the particular subjectivity of its writer(s) working within their particular institution, and these conditions and people inevitably raise questions about agency and power.

In Chapter 1, Asao Inoue offers a reflection on his recollection of an interaction with a Black female student in his assessment ecology that centered on explorations of HOWL in assessments of students' writing. It considers the ambiguity of his own failures as an antiracist teacher and alternatives to read the embodied ways his student responds in the ecology, as well as his own embodiment in feedback. Ultimately, he wonders how Black linguistic freedom can be exercised or even noticed in any classroom, antiracist or otherwise.

In Chapter 2, Wonderful Faison reflects on the problematics of teaching writing courses at an HBCU that requires her to be complicit in reproducing HOWL as a Black female professor. Comparing HOWL in writing pedagogies and assessment to "Foucault's theoretical connections between discipline, punishment, and crime," Faison focuses on how HBCUs can enforce and reinforce White supremacist language practices. This includes Black students' own self-disciplining. She says that her students "believed that assimilationist language and rhetoric (using HOWL) gave them the better chance to speak truth to power." We feel this urge in students shouldn't be dismissed, while also realizing that "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house," as Audre Lorde tells us (pg. 110-111). Faison's chapter is a call for educators to identify and

---

5.   We use "thour" here to note that one of us is racially White and one Brown. This means that the pronoun "their" doesn't work for one of us, but does for the other. So we've joined the pronouns their and our to language a new pronoun for our purposes: "thour."

challenge assimilationist rhetoric, especially in places designed in part to honor and invest in minoritized students.

In Chapter 3, Megan McIntyre reflects on her early attempts at co-creating feedback guidelines with students, identifying her "unseen, naturalized orientation to the world" (HOWL #1) as a catalyst for failure. She then considers her "own language histor[y] and practic[e] as rooted in particular racial and class-based identities," which informs her current practice of co-creating feedback guidelines with students. She concludes the chapter with a brief case study of her revised approach to this antiracist practice, in which she explicitly acknowledges the racist and colonialist histories of academic literacies and her own positionality as a White woman.

In Chapter 4, Lizbett Tinoco and Sonya Eddy discuss their experiences and concerns about attempting to disrupt White mainstream English (standardized American English) in a Hispanic-Serving Institution by engaging students in classroom assessment processes. Although Tinoco and Eddy both use labor-based assessment in their courses, they implemented a series of assignments on the rhetoric of rubrics to engage students in critical discussions about rubrics and what they represent. This process led students to create their own rubrics to help guide their writing practices. Although most students claimed the process had a positive impact on their writing, Tinoco and Eddy found that the use of rubrics was more complicated and nuanced than they anticipated since students continued to use White mainstream English. One observation they make from their assessment work with students is that "student agency in writing assessment does not necessarily equate to social and linguistic justice in assessment."

In Chapter 5, Kefaya Diab discusses the political tensions with students, colleagues, and administrators within White supremacy culture that challenged her antiracist pedagogy as a woman of color and non-native English speaker. Diab focuses on her own implementation of labor-based contracts, community-based learning, and antiracist writing assessment approaches in her writing courses, illuminating what she calls a "rhetoric of injury" that happens in White supremacy culture to minoritized teachers like herself. She attempts to answer questions about who tends to perpetuate rhetorics of injury, how they are encouraged or validated for doing it, and why no one notices the injuries. Her chapter ends by inviting White colleagues to systematically act as allies to racially minoritized teachers who implement critical and radical pedagogies.

In the final chapter of the section, written specially with graduate students and first-time writing teachers in mind, Alison R. Moore contemplates the impacts of her own raced and gendered subjectivities as a "White girl writing instructor" on her practice of composing writing assessment tools with students. She reflects on the ways that she and other White writing teachers often, even if unintentionally and with diverse and equitable practices in mind, still reproduce White, standardized discourses subject to teachers' judgements. Moore argues that this critical self-reflection and deconstruction of HOWL should be fundamental to

writing teacher training and models how White writing scholars and teachers can engage in the same kinds of critical self-reflective work they so often ask of their students.

Part Two: Collaborative Anti-Oppressive Pedagogies

The chapters in Section Two offer (and complicate) different approaches to developing anti-oppressive and socially just classroom assessment ecologies. Each of the chapters discusses a teacher's (or, in one case, writing center workers') experiences with various pedagogical strategies or theoretical frameworks that helped them rethink how assessment might work in their classrooms.

In Chapter 7, Kristin DeMint Bailey unpacks the teaching failure that led to this collection, one in which a carefully orchestrated approach to collaborative assessment designed to amplify *students'* priorities went awry. Through the retelling of this experience, DeMint Bailey explores the ways that *Whiteliness,* which Marilyn Frye defines as "a deeply ingrained way of being in the world" (Bell and Blumenfeld 1995, p. 117) and Dae-Joong Kim and Bobbi Olson add is an "epistemological worldview, a lens of judgment" (2017, p. 124), impacted the assessment ecology. Part of this exploration involves centering her own history with White working-class subjectivity in order to reveal how it obscured her own Whiteliness in an assessment approach she developed to produce antiracist results. She concludes the chapter by sharing the lessons learned while reflecting on this assessment ecology through the lens of Whiteliness.

In Chapter 8, Louis M. Maraj demonstrates how "assessment," particularly quantitative assessment, and sport statistics work in concert in historically White universities to force Black being into a value system, which rehearses transatlantic slavery logics. Maraj looks closely at a "Workshop in Composition" course at an eastern U.S. university. The course, which enrolls student athletes, uses a collaborative assessment practice in which students "game the system." The assessment ecology encourages students to build strategies that subvert anti-Black logics and steal back Black rhetorical agency from the classroom and university. Playing with traditional assessment models, as Maraj illustrates, allows glimpses at Black students' meaning-making agency by asking: What might assessment look like if borne out of experience rather than deficit?

In Chapter 9, Gavin P. Johnson focuses on composing differently oriented assessment ecologies with students and, specifically, calls for an intentional, iterative recognition of and engagement with assessment's affective attachments. Grounded by course documents from a digital media composing course at a Historically White Institution, Johnson zooms in and out of an assessment ecology detached from traditional grading regimes. He positions "queer" as a signifier of disruptive action wherein oppressive practices are exposed and replaced with assessment ecologies oriented by the affective attachments carried by students and teachers.

In Chapter 10, Sarah Prielipp draws on Shawn Wilson's (2008) Indigenous research paradigm as a framework for thinking about assessment as relational, accountable, and reciprocal. At the same time, Prielipp critiques her own positionality and how it affects her work within a settler colonial space, drawing attention to some of the complexities of antiracist work. She explains, "I use this Indigenous paradigm to frame my argument because, if we are going to say that Indigenous ways of knowing and doing are important to decolonization, to giving the land back and to Indigenous sovereignty, then we have to model that for our students whether we are White or non-White, and we need to practice our truths." Prielipp builds on Wilson's framework to develop a reflective participatory assessment that emphasizes these qualities.

In the final chapter of this section, three (at the time of this writing) full-time writing center administrators and one graduate assistant—Christopher Basgier, Amy Cicchino, Katharine H. Brown, and Megan Haskins—share their writing center's antiracist professional development curriculum and experiences in order to critique their practices and outcomes. With this curriculum, the authors aimed to deepen peer consultants' engagement with antiracism and prepare consultants to do an antiracist assessment of the curriculum's resources, such as training modules and workshop materials. The writers interrogate their approach, exploring ways they continued to recenter Whiteness by emphasizing inclusivity at the expense of antiracism and forcing additional labor on BIPOC consultants.

The collection ends with an afterword by Jesse Stommel that argues to dismantle grading systems that have harmed students and teachers, especially, and perhaps most critically, BIPOC and other minoritized students, which includes students with housing and food insecurities. Ultimately, he calls for a "co-intentional assessment" space that comes out of Freire's discussion in *Education for Critical Consciousness*. Such assessment spaces in classrooms are ones created together by teachers and students. They entail embodied and political work. Such assessment, Stommel reminds us, is treating our students as fully human.

Conclusion

As we've learned in the classroom, through developing this collection, and by learning from other teacher-scholars, antiracist work is brave, vulnerable, and embodied work. It's compassionate work. It's love work. Because love is recognizing our interdependence and acting from that deep awareness. And what's more vulnerable, yet sustainable, than interdependence? We need each other to do this work. We are always stronger when we do it together. Not coincidentally, we (all of us involved in the production of this book) have needed each other to develop the collection that lies before you, as we wrestled together with the ideas, interpretations, and takeaways that emerged through extensive revision. Like the teaching and assessing it discusses, this collection was a labor of love. We encourage you to read it as a constellation of interdependent voices, all of which can

help us to think more critically about the antiracist work of language assessment in our various institutional contexts from our diverse positionalities, and with a good share of love.

References

Ahmed, S. (2007). A phenomenology of whiteness. *Feminist Theory, 8*(2), 149-168. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700107078139

Ahmed, S., & Stacey, J. (2001). *Thinking through the skin*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203165706

Alexander, S. A. James. (2003). Walking on thin ice: The il/legitimacy of race and racial issues in the classroom. In D. P. Freedman & M. S. Holmes (Eds.), *The teacher's body: Embodiment, authority, and identity in the academy* (pp. 105-118). State University of New York Press.

Bartlett, L. E. (2015). Performing pedagogy: Negotiating the "appropriate" and the possible in the writing classroom. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education, 4*(2), Article 3, 38-56. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte/vol4/iss2/3

Beavers, M., Brunk-Chavez, B. L., Green, N.-A., Inoue, A. B., Ruiz, I., Saenkhum, T., & Young, V. A. (2021, June 11). Abbreviated statement toward first-year composition goals. *Institute of Race, Rhetoric, and Literacy.* Google doc. https://tinyurl.com/IRRL-FYCGoals

Bell, L. A., & Blumenfeld, D. (1995). *Overcoming racism and sexism*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003/2018). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (5th ed.). Rowan and Littlefield.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Conference on College Composition and Communication Contributors. (2021, June). *CCCC statement on White language supremacy.* https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/white-language-supremacy

Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism*. Indiana University Press.

Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.

Inoue, A. B. (2005). *The epistemology of racism and community-based assessment practice* Doctoral Dissertation, Washington State University. http://www.dissertations.wsu.edu/Dissertations/Spring2005/a%5Finoue%5F012205.pdf.

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. (2021). *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

Johnson, M., Levy, D., Manthey, K., & Novotny, M. (2015). Embodiment: Embodying feminist rhetorics. *Peitho, 18*(1), 39-44.

Kim, D.-J., & Olson, B. (2017). Deconstructing whiteliness in the globalized classroom. In F. Condon & V. A. Young (Eds.), *Performing antiracist pedagogy in rhetoric, writing, and communication* (pp. 123-158). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2016.0933

Knoblauch, A. A., & Moeller, M. E. (2022). Introduction: Bodies, embodiment, embodied rhetorics. In A. A. Knoblauch & M. E. Moeller (Eds.), *Bodies of knowledge: Embodied rhetorics in theory and practice* (pp. 3-19). Utah State University Press.

Lorde, A. (1984/1993). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Quality Paperback Book Club.

Manivannan, V. (2022). The successful text is not always the one that murders me to protect you. In A. A. Knoblauch & M. E. Moeller (Eds.). *Bodies of knowledge: Embodied rhetorics in theory and practice* (pp. 183-198). Utah State University Press.

Payne, M. (1994). Rend(er)ing women's authority in the writing classroom. In L. Tobin & T. Newkirk (Eds.), *Taking stock: The writing process movement in the '90s*. Heinemann Boynton/Cook.

Price, M. (2015). The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain. *New Conversations in Feminist Disability Studies. Hypatia, 30*(1), 270-284.

Pritchard, E. (2017). *Fashioning lives: Black queers and the politics of literacy*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosch, E. (2017). Introduction to the Revised Edition. In F. J. Varela, E. Thompson, & E. Rosch (Eds.), *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience* (Rev. ed., pp. xxxv-lvi). MIT Press.

Stenberg, S. (2002). Embodied classrooms, embodied knowledges: Re-thinking the mind/body split. *Composition Studies, 30*(2), 43-60.

Weiss, G. (1999). *Body images: Embodiment as intercorporeality*. Routledge.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford University Press.

Wilson, E. A. (2015). *Gut feminism*. Duke University Press.