



Set Your Stance!

All golfers have an identity and specific traits, movements, and idiosyncrasies that make them unique. Every golfer approaches the course and each hole on the course differently. These characteristics shape a golfer's identity. They are always present, and they often show up in a golfer's stance and approach to the tee box.

Just as golfers have identities, writing leaders also have their own identities that have been shaped by their prior experiences. Additionally, every writing program crafts its own identity through the leadership of the program administrator.

We really like that Andrew Hollinger's chapter asks readers to think about crafting their identity and to think about "anchoring" their practice in specific ideas, moves, and practices that make them unique. We love this concept of anchoring one's program. Given the complexities of the last few years and the myriad of possibilities for modalities, we see the value in thinking about how to cultivate and keep a programmatic cohesion.

Chapter 4. Designing Anchor Points

Andrew Hollinger

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS RIO GRANDE VALLEY

Abstract: Writing programs that offer a range of instructional modalities (such as online synchronous, online asynchronous, face-to-face [F2F], and hybrid) can find it difficult to maintain programmatic identity and instructional or course comparability across modalities. Part of the difficulty is that each delivery modality has specific material and pedagogical requirements for success. That is, an online asynchronous course must look, feel, and act differently than the F2F iteration of the course—which also means the online version cannot be simply the digital version of the F2F course. How, then, does a writing program develop and maintain itself as a “program” amidst so many material entanglements? In this chapter, I present anchor points as a pedagogical and administrative PARS-based approach to developing cohesion between instructional modalities.

Keywords: anchor points, writing program administration, curriculum design, first-year writing, equity, instructional modalities, programmatic cohesion

“We’re all online writing instructors,” say Jessie Borgman and Casey McArdle (2019, p. 3).

Pre-2020: OK, sure. It makes sense. Between the various technologies students use to write and read, the hardware and software we incorporate into our teaching, acknowledging the hybrid ways face-to-face (F2F) instruction uses learning management systems (LMSs) or OneDrive/Google Drive/the cloud, yes, we’re all online writing instructors. Maybe I don’t *exactly* do my lecturing and instruction online, but I get it, yes.

Post-2020: Ain’t that the truth.

This chapter is not about the COVID-19 pandemic. It’s about developing curricular and programmatic cohesion between face-to-face (F2F) and online instructional modalities. But it’s also uncritical (at least) or disingenuous (at worst) to pretend that online instruction in 2023 and beyond is not informed by the sudden and nearly ubiquitous shift to online learning in 2020. Moving forward, however, we are no longer subject to “emergency remote instruction” and need to ensure that the lessons from the last three years *and* the previous decades of online writing instruction (OWI) research are applied. This chapter is about using anchor points—designed instances of commonality across program elements such as content, assignments, texts, and experiences to develop programmatic

cohesion between instructional modalities. To establish our own parity across our writing program, we developed the following:

- *anchor concepts*, the philosophical and pedagogical foundations we build curriculum from;
- *anchor practices*, the skills and habits students should engage with throughout the course sequence; and
- *anchor texts*, common texts that all sections of a course will include as part of instruction.

These anchor points (concepts, practices, texts) are part of a larger practice of our developing courses that are personal, accessible, responsive, and strategic (PARS). Throughout this chapter, I will discuss the anchor concepts, practices, and texts that our writing program developed; the process for creating and shaping anchor points; and the connections between anchor points and PARS. I will also argue that the use of anchor points is a progressive and equitable pedagogical practice that is particularly effective at attuning large writing programs (or, really, any program, department, or unit) to the needs of their students, faculty, and discipline.

Institutional Context

For example, at my institution (where we have a two-course first-year writing [FYW] sequence), pre-2020 we generally offered two fully online asynchronous sections of 1301 (course one) and two to four fully online asynchronous sections of 1302 (course two). These courses were taught by instructors who had robust training in online instruction, including (but not limited to) the writing program's professional development for online instructors, our institution's learning management system (LMS) training, and Quality Matters (QM) certification. So, that's four to six online sections (out of 165!) each semester taught by instructors who had participated in significant professional development for online instruction.

Our pre-2020 goal was to deliberately and methodically develop a path toward online instruction for faculty while also determining the threshold at which adding online sections increased overall 1301/1302 enrollment. That is, we learned that adding online sections increases overall enrollment for the writing program, but only up to a point. There is a threshold at which adding online courses decreases F2F, and thus overall, enrollment. Slow progress was perfectly acceptable. We didn't have a large demand for online courses during the regular semesters. Students showed more interest in online instructional options during the summer (perhaps because it allowed them more possibility to work or travel), and we provided both asynchronous and synchronous online instruction during the two summer sessions.

The COVID-19 pandemic dramatically altered the course of our designed and programmatic approach to developing online writing instruction. We went from

four to six online sections per semester to 165 online sections (about 40% asynchronous and 60% synchronous) per semester through Spring/Summer 2021. In the Fall 2021 semester, we began reintroducing hybrid courses (courses that are 15%-85% online, F2F for the remaining portion). We had a few fully F2F courses but were still largely online. In the Spring 2022 term, our institution began returning to pre-pandemic scheduling and modality. But it really didn't. The writing program offered in Spring 2022 more online sections and more hybrid sections than we ever had before. And the scheduling for Fall 2022 showed that our online offerings, instead of creeping toward our enrollment threshold, are right at the point where we maximize overall enrollment.

More than that, to revise Borgman and McArdle (2019), we're *all* online writing instructors *now*. Pre-pandemic, we had a few instructors with online teaching experience. Today, everyone has 18-24 months of online teaching experience. Not everyone has completed our online training professional development, of course. But we've all got experience with LMS environments, online feedback, virtual lessons, technical difficulties, and the strangeness of student retention that is somehow different online than in person. Instead of the delicate piloting of new ideas or strategies, most of our instructors had to learn by doing, which is equal parts thrilling and terrifying. On one hand, having/not having professional development in online writing instruction might be the difference between having *experience* with online writing instruction and *being* an online writing instructor. On the other hand, the experience of teaching online is incredibly valuable to honing one's skills as an online writing instructor. For example, we also have much more data, post-emergency remote instruction, than we otherwise would have. At our institution, for instance, online synchronous courses have a better pass rate and better student retention than online asynchronous courses; and the second course in our FYW course sequence has better passing and retention numbers than the first course. The result is that we have an entire faculty increasingly equipped to teach online, and we have more opportunities for online instruction than we would have had following our original plan. Following the data, we schedule more synchronous online sections than we do asynchronous sections, though we continue to work on increasing our asynchronous pass/retention rates. Online writing instruction is here to stay (at our institution, but also, just generally as a desired and increasingly less stigmatized instructional modality).

I don't think it's an unfair observation, however, that *even though* we had, from our previous piloting, several developed course shells, examples of activities and tasks, guidance on creating rapport, and suggestions for framing the content and projects for online learning, the primary objective for most instructors during the last three years was to survive physically, mentally, and emotionally. How do we take the experiences of the last three years and the growth and development plan from before the pandemic and re-establish a programmatic approach toward online instruction? And, also, why bother?

Theory and Practice

Arguing for Anchor Points

I'm the quasi-writing program administrator (qWPA; Hollinger & Borgman, 2020) for a large writing program, serving 3,500-4,000 students each semester in 155-170 sections. Our goal is to be a writing *program*, identifiable by a shared mission and vision, pedagogical philosophy, and curricular foundation (as opposed to a collection of classes that all just happen to be called "ENGL 1301" and "ENGL 1302"). I'm not interested in deploying identical courses across 155-170 sections. That doesn't make use of the individual skills, talents, and interests of our more than 30 full-time lecturers or the handful of part-time lecturers and teaching assistants (TAs) we hire each year. However, I think it's important for a writing program, in order to be a cohesive program, to provide comparable experiences for students across a designed and purposeful curriculum. Comparable experiences might also be framed as "accessible" curriculum. Of course, online and F2F learning spaces need to be accessible in terms of usability, support, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). But, all 165 sections of ENGL 1301 should also provide equitable and comparable access to the content, knowledge, and skills of the class being taught. We could call this programmatic accessibility. When a program offers both F2F and online versions of the same courses, ensuring curricular cohesion and programmatic accessibility simultaneously becomes more important and more difficult.

Borgman and McArdle (2019) point out that "it is difficult to shift F2F instruction to a digital space" (p. 11), a commonplace now well established as part of the lived experiences of all those who taught through the pandemic. More to the point, however, is that different modalities have different affordances and capacities, and entangle students, instructors, and content in differing and particular ways. In "(Re)turning to Hypertext: Mattering Digital Learning Spaces," Manuel Piña (2023) argues that material conditions of online (or any, really) learning spaces *matter*, both metaphorically and literally. Everything from the chair the student is using to their computer or device to whether they're using wireless headphones changes how a student engages with the course material. We can't necessarily design the student's space, but we can design *for* the student's space. Heidi Skurat Harris and Michael Greer (2016) affirm that "to teach writing online is to design an environment" (p. 46). I'd argue that to teach at all is to design an environment, but their point obtains: What's important is that each environment is responsive to the material conditions in which it exists. F2F classes exist in different ways than online classes. And online asynchronous classes exist in different ways than online synchronous classes. Curriculum design, then, is not a one-size-fits-all endeavor; courses must be intentionally designed for F2F, online, or hybrid entangled encounters. Each modality needs instructional approaches and

support specific to its material conditions. At a programmatic scale, maintaining alignment between modalities can become tricky.

The solution for designing curriculum and courses flexible enough to adapt to varying modalities while also providing programmatic accessibility and cohesion is *anchor points, designed points of commonality shared between diverse iterations of comparable courses*. Anchor points can be any combination of texts, concepts, experiences, tasks, activities, and assignments that exist across all sections of a course. For example, an anchor experience might be attending a special lecture sponsored by the university or participating in service learning. Although our courses do have anchor experiences, we primarily design around anchor concepts, anchor practices, and anchor texts. Anchor concepts are the large/umbrella ideas that inform our course content and pedagogy. These are ideas that every student who comes through the writing program should engage and grapple with by the end of our FYW course sequence—that is, things we want our students to know. Anchor practices and skills are those things we want our students to be able to do at the end of our course sequence. Anchor texts are common and foundational texts that all sections of ENGL 1301 or ENGL 1302 must include (instructors can add texts to their courses; the anchor texts are simply designed moments of parity).

Anchor points allow instructors to remain personal/personable (the *P* in PARS) in their instruction and approach while also allowing the writing program to be accessible and strategic (the *A* and *S* in PARS) about curriculum and institutional positionality. Whatever instructive path an instructor might take—whether service learning, project-based, thematic, cooperative learning focus, small tasks, large tasks, writing in the disciplines, writing for your life, writing about writing (and so on)—there are a few first-year writing common *places* (it's not a golf pun but the wordplay between *common place* and *commonplace* is nice, no?) all students will pause and consider. In addition to developing programmatic identity and cohesion, designing anchor points allows us to identify sites of equity, sites of practice, and sites of engagement that all students and instructors will encounter—which has also been an important element of our developing pedagogy that focuses on languaging and antiracist practices.

What does this mean for designing online instruction?

There is curricular parity between F2F and online instruction. Even if the course narrative or instructor's path is different, students across 150+ sections have moments of similarity.

Following backward design/understanding by design, anchor points make developing assignments and projects easier and better scaffolded.

Students are engaging with designed experiences.

Instructors can move between F2F and online courses more easily.

An important consequence of this process is that, as a program (which includes full-time three-year and one-year lecturers, tenure/track rhet-comp profs, TAs, the writing center, even the library), we are constantly talking about what

our first-year writing program should be about. What do we want to teach? What do we want our students to walk away with? Designing anchor points results in a highly reflective cohort of instructors learning from each other, challenging each other, and collaborating about the direction and future of the writing program. Rhonda Thomas et al. (2021) argue that “the department chair and the WPA need to regularly talk with instructors about important values, such as student success, not just talk at faculty about the basic requirements for their online classes” (p. 200), and that’s what designing anchor points does for a writing program. To be clear, anchor points (whether concepts, texts, practices, or experiences) are not merely “basic requirements.” It’s more productive to think about anchor points as the pedagogical philosophy and foundation of the program, the stuff from which we design and develop assignments, lessons, and assessments.

Mid-chapter takeaways and anchor points’ connections to PARS are shown in the following Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 PARS and Anchor Points

Personal	Accessible	Responsive	Strategic
Instructors retain creative autonomy. Identical courses and materials are not required.	Sections are comparable in content and scope.	Programmatic mission, curriculum, etc. is reflective and progressive	Program positional-ity is designed and articulable.

Developing Anchor Points

Because anchor points are so specific to a writing program’s context and goals, a universal step-by-step guide is impractical (perhaps impossible). But throughout this section, you’ll find practices and a heuristic that will be helpful for any program or faculty group interested in developing a set of anchor points. Looking at examples of anchor points should also be helpful. The following anchor concepts, practices, and texts are iterations of our own anchor point development(see Table 4.2).

There are a few important things to notice here. These concepts and skills begin in 1301 and continue through 1302 (our two-course FYW sequence), and that’s why we note “by the end of ENGL 1302, students should . . .” It’s possible to articulate specific knowledge and skills as anchor points for individual courses in a sequence, but we’ve opted not to do that. For us, these concepts and practices are additive, and we want them to be part of all our writing courses.¹

1. For what it’s worth, our first course, 1301, could be called “Writing Studies,” where students confront assumptions about what writing and composition *is*, and what “good” writing is, how composition works, the creative/writing process, and writing inquiry. Our second course, 1302, could be called “Research Studies,” and, building from 1301, asks

Table 4.2 Anchor Points and Anchor Concepts

Anchor Concepts	Anchor Practices
<p>By the end of ENGL 1302, students should (at least) know . . .</p> <p>Writing/reading/literacy are activities and subjects of study</p> <p>Writing/literacy are social and rhetorical activities</p> <p>Writing speaks to situations through recognizable forms</p> <p>Writing/literacy enacts and creates identities and ideologies</p> <p>All writers have more to learn</p> <p>Writing/reading/learning are processes</p> <p>“Good” writing depends on the expectations of the discourse community/audience</p> <p>Writing involves making choices about language</p> <p>Rhetorical ecologies are robust, entangled networks of human and nonhuman rhetorical agents</p> <p>All writing is multimodal</p>	<p>By the end of ENGL 1302, students should be able (at least) to . . .</p> <p>Revise a project through several drafts + incorporate feedback into a revision plan</p> <p>Give effective feedback</p> <p>Develop inquiry from experiences, texts, etc. (primarily 1301)</p> <p>Develop research question(s) (primarily 1302)</p> <p>Synthesize multiple sources/perspectives</p> <p>Evaluate sources and evidence</p> <p>Incorporate and appropriately attribute source material and evidence</p> <p>Articulate the purpose, form, and audience of their own texts and the texts of others</p> <p>Make sophisticated languaging choices</p> <p>Articulate their rhetorical composing choices</p> <p>Discuss their learning and how their emerging knowledge and skills transfer to other contexts, areas, ecologies, and communities</p>

Also, these concepts and practices are (or are very close to) writing studies threshold concepts, many of which were described in Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle’s (2016) *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*. We didn’t set out to develop our anchor concepts alongside threshold concepts, but it makes sense that we ended up there. Threshold concepts comprise the difficult-to-understand but critical-to-know knowledge in a discipline. If we treat composition and rhetoric as an introduction to the discipline, then the concepts and practices we articulate as foundational are likely to sound like threshold concepts. Finally, anchor points, framed as concepts and practices, might look a bit like student (or course) learning objectives (SLOs), but they’re not. Take, for example, our SLOs at the time we developed our anchor points (this is directly from the university-required syllabus language; see Table 4.3).

students to engage with research practices, developing lines of inquiry, informational literacy, and so on.

Table 4.3 WP Student Learning Outcomes

WP Student Learning Outcomes
<p>The following statements describe what we want our students to know, think, value, and do when they finish the First-Year Writing Program and successfully complete 1302 with a C or better.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students use the writing process to compose with purpose, creating multimodal texts for various audiences. • Students productively interact with their peers, often in small groups, in the reiterative processes of feedback, revision, and editing. • Students think critically about their position in the context of a larger ongoing conversation about the issues they are investigating. • Students find, evaluate, meaningfully integrate, and correctly document appropriate sources for research. • Students are aware of the choices writers make and gain confidence in their ability to employ that awareness for a variety of future writing tasks.

These were our SLOs when we first developed our anchor points (in spring 2022, we began the process of revising and updating our SLOs, and at the time of this writing, that work was still in progress). These objectives are similar to the course/learning objectives of programs around the country. The anchor concepts and practices are more granular points of focus than even SLOs are. For example, “writing/literacy enacts and creates identities and ideologies” is a more precise articulation of SLO 3, “students think critically about their position in the context of a larger ongoing conversation.” So, students don’t just think about their positionality, which is a sophisticated task already, but also work to understand the ways in which composing practices, conventions, genres, opportunities, and constraints contribute to their positionality and also to the positionalities of the rhetorical agents in the “larger ongoing conversation.” What’s the point of this? The SLO describes a direction of learning (critical positioning in ongoing conversations), but the anchor concept describes a disciplinary and pedagogical philosophy that a critical element of positionality is the way those ongoing conversations actually interpolate our own identities and ideologies. The disciplinary and pedagogical philosophy leads to discussions/lessons/assignments about genre, conventions, hegemony, power structures, languaging, and so on—which is one of the ways our antiracist pedagogy and languaging-focused philosophy and mission moves from mission statement to pedagogical foundation to classroom lesson.² The takeaway is that SLOs accomplish a certain kind of work, and

2. Smith et al. (2021) present a 3x3 grid for developing online writing curriculum using the PARS framework. Their grid is an example of how anchor points can lead to curriculum decisions. The theory, foundations, and philosophies that their grids are based on are anchor concepts and practices. The grid shows one way anchor concepts/practices can be translated into curriculum, projects and assignments, and instructor choice. Their grid is also similar to our anchor texts list, using potential projects instead of potential reading.

anchor points another. The anchor points help facilitate the “walk the talk” of our pedagogies, SLOs, and equity and language statements. Anchor points represent an important waypoint between values and doing.

Along with anchor concepts and practices, we also developed a list of anchor texts (see the appendix for examples of our current list). Notice that the texts are not all required. Instead, instructors choose a few texts from the lists to add to their courses. And, as long as instructors choose three texts from the lists, they can add as many other texts or excerpts as makes sense for their course. The anchor texts are the most concrete element of our anchor points because although we are all teaching toward the anchor concepts and practices, the way that happens is designed by the instructor. The texts, however, are a commitment we make to each other and the program to design for and around. These are discrete instances of commonality across all sections. But these aren’t just texts. These texts support the anchor concepts and practices, and so support our pedagogical goals.

Freewrite, Part I: Brainstorming Anchor Points

What do you want your students to know and do by the end of your program’s course(s)? Brainstorm your ideas in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Anchor Concepts and Practices

<p>Anchor Concepts</p> <p>This column represents the content and disciplinary knowledge you want students to walk away with.</p>	<p>Anchor Practices</p> <p>This column represents the skills, practices, and habits you want students to walk away with.</p>

As you work through this process, here are some things to consider:

- Sometimes it's helpful for faculty or a committee group to do this activity separately and then build collaborative lists. This allows all voices to be heard, not just the loudest ones (who might benefit from doing more listening . . .). But it's also an important reflective practice. We should regularly engage with this question: What do we want students to know and do?
- Lists shouldn't be too long. Both anchor concepts and practices should have pedagogical space that leads to several different lessons, activities, and potential projects. For example, our anchor concept that "writing/literacy are social and rhetorical activities" leads to lessons about giving and receiving feedback, doing revision, and making decisions about writing, but also discussions about how and where writing and literacy norms are established.
- Concepts and practices are not static and should be revisited at regular intervals (more on this later).
- Concepts and practices should have connections to the program (or institutional) value statements (these could be mission, vision, or objective statements). For example, if a program's philosophy statement includes a bullet point like "students have a right to their own language and a responsibility to engage with their own languaging practices" *but* an anchor practice is "students must be proficient at APA formatting," there's been a disconnect. A better anchor practice would be something like "students make citational choices" because that leads to lessons about what citation accomplishes and asks students to become rhetorical agents of when and how and where to give credit to their sources.

Designing Anchor Points, Process

All combined, consider how the anchor concepts, practices, and texts reinforce our program's commitment to languaging and antiracist pedagogy (and how anchor concepts/practices/texts can demonstrate and describe the philosophical and pedagogical goals of your writing program). These texts ask students to confront their assumptions about language and the ways certain languaging practices become labeled "good" or "smart" or "academic" or "professional."³ Additionally, in 2020, our writing program began an audit of our practices and texts to ensure our

3. This is particularly important for our institution. We are a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) with over 92 percent of students identifying as Hispanic. Additionally, the institution made a commitment to be bilingual, bicultural, and biliterate, though in the writing program we prefer to frame it as multilingual, multicultural, and multiliterate. Our SLOs ask students to "be aware of their choices," but our anchor practices ask students to "make sophisticated languaging choices." For our program, understanding how students can and should employ language is critical to the mission of the university and of our writing program.

pedagogy was equitable and antiracist. We realized that our texts were overwhelmingly written by older, White scholars. We also came to understand the financial burden requiring a specific textbook had on our students. So, when we designed our anchor texts, we worked to ensure that the texts were available as PDFs and that we were integrating the work of Black, Indigenous, people of color (BIPOC) and multiply marginalized scholars into the concrete, common moments across all 1301 and 1302 sections. The point isn't that any writing program should use these particular texts but that the combination of anchor concepts, practices, and texts can be used by writing programs to describe and demonstrate the values, objectives, and work that their curriculum and pedagogy are doing.⁴ This is part of the strategic work we can do programmatically to ensure that our courses are doing what we say we're doing in our mission statements and SLOs.

The process for developing anchor points is not complex, but it might be difficult.

We began by interrogating our perceptions of ourselves as a program: Who are we as a program? What do we value? What do we stand for? What are we teaching?⁵

Then, we mapped those values and reflections onto our SLOs. This helped us determine if any of our current SLOs did not appear in our values or if any of our values did not appear in our SLOs.

We continued the discussion and mapping by very seriously grappling with two more questions: What do we want students to know? (these became anchor concepts) and What do we want students to be able to do? (these became anchor practices). Of course, because we're teachers, we implicitly address these questions all the time. But it's not as common to have these discussions as a program and to make decisions about that knowledge and those practices that will then be somewhat codified into program documents. The results of these discussions were again mapped onto our SLOs and to our values. (The document gets messy, heavily annotated, and difficult to read by anyone who isn't part of the group. But that means it's working.)

4. However, for anyone interested in using texts from BIPOC and multiply marginalized scholars for first-year writing or technical communication courses, we developed this crowdsourced list to help get the process started: alternative texts and critical citations for antiracist pedagogies.

5. Because we are a large writing program, I asked for volunteers to be on a committee to evaluate and design program documents and curriculum. As the WPA, I made the decision to develop this system of anchor points, though I was open to this failing and needing to develop some other idea. The committee and I did the initial design work for the anchor points, sent our work to writing program faculty for comments, revised, and then as a writing program we sort of ratified the plan (though that's not exactly the right word). We worked from committee because it would have been impractical to have the entire program design together. However, we accepted the work and established the system as a program.

After we had determined the values, concepts, and practices, we looked for texts that would support the teaching and doing of those anchor points. We wanted to provide more texts than necessary so instructors could choose the texts that were most meaningful and productive.

Finally, you have to determine the revision cycle. Every three years? Every five? Any administrative initiative or practice will become entrenched and part of a new hegemony if there aren't deliberately designed opportunities to revise the system. Revising every three or five years seems to make sense because it's enough time to implement, tweak, assess efficacy, and determine what works and how to improve.

Freewrite, Part II: Designing Anchor Points

Let the process of developing anchor points be rough, sketched out, annotated doodles. This process is messy and a continual work-in-progress. Your process should look a little like Figure 4.1 though you should also add or remove elements to make the process meaningful for your program. For example, we worked our process on dry erase boards in F2F meetings. This could also be done on a Miro board to great effect (miro.com is a digital collaborative space that is free and has a ton of helpful elements). The example is abridged for space and readability. The mapping and annotation process is generally more developed.

Take a moment to begin developing your own anchor points (see Table 4.5). Using the concepts and practices you sketched out in Freewrite Part I, Brainstorming Anchor Points, add annotations, map connections, and begin suggesting anchor texts. Annotations might include shared assignments or experiences, course sequence planning, ideas for collaborative lesson planning, and so on.

CONCEPTS	VALUES	PRACTICES
<p>Writing/literacy are social and rhetorical activities</p> <p>Writing/reading/learning are processes</p> <p>"Good" writing depends on the expectations of the discourse community/ audience</p>	<p>Writing, composition, and knowledge are socially informed. As such, collaborative work and review is an important element for contemporary composition.</p>	<p>Revise a project through several drafts + incorporate feedback into a revision plan</p> <p>Synthesize multiple sources/ perspectives</p> <p>Articulate their rhetorical composing choices</p>
<p><small>Good, academic, professional, effective can/should be problematized. Who decides what good is? How can we disrupt hegemonic conceptions of good/ professional/academic?</small></p> <p>Cedillo, C & Bratta, P. (2019). Relating our experiences: The practice of positionality in student-centered pedagogy. <i>CCC 71</i>(2), 215-240.</p>		
TEXTS		

Figure 4.1 Concepts, Values and Practices

Table 4.5 Anchor Points Mapping

Concepts Import from Part I	Values What philosophy, mission, vision guides your programmatic decisions?	Practices Import from Part I
Texts What texts connect the concepts, practices, and program values? List and annotate those texts above.		

Conclusion and Takeaways

There are two main takeaways for this chapter:

1. Instructional modalities (online synchronous, online asynchronous, hybrid, F2F, traditional, flex path, etc.) cannot use a one-size-fits-all curriculum or delivery method. Each modality has its own material boundaries in which success can be articulated.
2. Anchor points are a valuable programmatic tool that, when developed strategically, can facilitate cohesion between instructional modalities, maintain program identity, and describe and articulate pedagogical foundations.

Historically, writing programs have had difficulty articulating their value to the institution. Anchor points are a codification of programmatic value in institutional terms rather than (only) rhetoric and composition terms. That is, instead of saying “FYW is important because it teaches students to write and to think critically,” we can say “by the end of FYW, students will know [these things], be able to do [these things], and all this aligns with our program and institutional vision statements in [these ways], and these documents articulate the disciplinary foundations that connect our philosophy to our pedagogy to our institutional mission.” Anchor points make tangible the work that writing programs are already doing.

Anchor points also highlight opportunities for personal, accessible, responsive, and strategic (PARS) connections between program and faculty. One of my fears as the WPA for a large writing program is that some mandate will come down from a non-writing administrator that all sections need to use identical syllabuses, projects, tasks, assignments, lessons, everything so that all our students are having the same experience. Although I’ve seen successful writing programs

under this model, my concern is that (in this hypothetical scenario) the decision was made for administrative and austerity reasons and not because it is good teaching. How, then, can I ensure that all sections are providing comparable learning experiences for all students, especially in light of our new online course offerings, while also allowing instructors creative autonomy and room to develop their own ideas, assignments, and activities?

For us, the answer has been anchor points, particularly because anchor points fit within Borgman and McArdle's (2019) PARS framework so well. That is, anchor points provide personal-accessible-responsive-strategic common *places* within a semester and course sequence. Faculty continue to design and develop course materials that are interesting and meaningful to them and their students (*personal*). The anchor concepts, practices, and texts ensure that all sections have moments of curricular and pedagogical commonality (*accessible*). And the anchor points are regularly examined and revised to ensure the writing program is reflective, responding to changes in the discipline and the institution and the students' needs (*responsive*). All this is particularly important (and good news) for programs that offer a range of modalities. For example, we offer F2F, hybrid, online synchronous, and (some) online asynchronous. Even though instructors in online and hybrid spaces need to design environments and classroom practices that are specific to the material affordances of those spaces, and even though F2F instruction has different material realities than those online spaces, the curricular and pedagogical experiences of students in both those spaces are designed to be both relevant and comparable. At the same time, the writing program is able to articulate how all sections of ENGL 1301 and ENGL 1302 are doing analogous work that is pedagogically rigorous and aligned with institutional goals (*strategic*).

References

- Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (Eds.). (2016). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies*. Utah State University Press.
- Borgman, J., & McArdle, C. (2019). *Personal, accessible, responsive, strategic: Resources and strategies for online writing instructors*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PRA-B.2019.0322>
- Hollinger, A., & Borgman, J. (2020). (Dis)similarity and identity: On becoming quasi-WPA (qWPA). *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 44(1), 130-149. <https://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sp/journal-archives>
- Phillips, T., Shovlin, P., & Titus, M. (2018). An exercise in cognitive dissonance: Liminal WPAs in transition. In C. A. Wooten, J. Babb, & B. Ray (Eds.), *WPAs in transition: Navigating educational leadership positions* (pp. 70-86). University of Colorado; Utah State University Press.
- Piña, M. (2023). (Re)turning to hypertext: Mattering digital learning spaces. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 53(2), 153-171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2022.2095424>

- Skurat Harris, H., & Greer, M. (2016). Over, under, or through: Design strategies to supplement the LMS and enhance interaction in online writing courses. *Communication Design Quarterly* 4(4), 46-54. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3071088.3071093>
- Smith, A., Chernouski, L., Batti, B., Karabinus, A., & Dilger, B. (2021). People, programs, and practices: A grid-based approach to designing and supporting online writing curriculum. In J. Borgman & C. McArdle (Eds.), *PARS in practice: More resources and strategies for online writing instructors* (pp. 83-96). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PRA-B.2021.1145.2.05>
- Thomas, R., Kuralt, K., Skurat Harris, H. & Jensen, G. (2021). Create, support, and facilitate personal online writing courses in online writing programs. In J. Borgman & C. McArdle (Eds.), *PARS in practice: More resources and strategies for online writing instructors*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. 185-207. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PRA-B.2021.1145>

Appendix

Anchor Texts (2020 Fall–present)

- ENGL 1301 (please include 3 of the following texts in your ENGL 1301 course)
- Brandt, “Sponsors of Literacy” (recommend excerpt instead of full text) AND Medina, “Decolonial Potential in a Multilingual FYC”
- Vasudevan, “Literacies in a Participatory, Multimodal World: The Arts and Aesthetics of Web 2.0”
- Villanueva, “Writing Provides a Representation of Ideologies and Identities” [short text from *Naming What We Know*] (pp. 57-58)
- Villanueva, “Bootstraps” [excerpt from *WAW* 4th Ed.] (pp. 272-285)
- Cedillo, “What Does it Mean to Move?: Race, Disability, and Critical Embodiment Pedagogy” (recommend excerpt instead of full text)
- Alvarez, “Official American English is Best” [short text from *Bad Ideas About Writing*, the title is meant to be tongue in cheek] (pp. 93-98)
- Pattanayak, “There is Only One Correct Way of Writing and Speaking” [short text from *Bad Ideas About Writing*] (pp. 82-87)
- ENGL 1302 (please include 3 of the following texts in your ENGL 1302 course)
- Cedillo & Bratta, “Relating Our Experiences: The Practice of Positionality in Student-Centered Pedagogy”
- Olivas, “Cupping the Spark in Our Hands: Developing a Better Understanding of the Research Question in Inquiry-Based Writing”
- Wilson, “On the Research Journey” (from *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*)
- Gonzales, “Multimodality, Translingualism, and Rhetorical Genre Studies”
- Young, “Should Writers Use They Own English”