



## Woah, Water, Bunkers, the Rough! Yikes!

When golfing anytime or anywhere, whether you're a professional golfer, an amateur golfer, or it's your first time out on a course ever, you will need to anticipate obstacles. There will be things you don't plan for and you'll need to decide how to react. Fast greens, sudden bad weather, annoying playing partners, lots and lots of hidden bunkers, and so on!

This can also be true of administering a writing program. There will always be things that occur that you don't anticipate or don't plan for, and because you're in charge, you'll have to decide how to handle it.

What we like about Marisa Yerace's chapter is that she raises this idea of preparing for the worst through the use of the word and the concept of *agile*. To be agile means you're able to move quickly and easily. Yerace draws from her previous research to argue that putting together a plan based on PARS can aid administrators in responding effectively to problems that arise, such as an unexpected pandemic.

# Chapter 6. Agile Writing Programs

Marisa Yerace  
PURDUE UNIVERSITY

**Abstract:** This chapter presents findings from my ongoing study involving conversations with writing program administrators (WPAs) about how they navigated their programs' emergency switch to remote instruction in spring 2020. I use these reflections and recommendations to give readers a starting point for making their own writing programs more agile in the face of crisis and change—so that instructors and administrators can think on their feet without falling over. In doing so, I draw upon ideas from personal, accessible, responsive, strategic (PARS) principles for online writing instruction (Borgman & McArdle, 2019) and Agile software development (Beck et al., 2001). Agile development's values align easily with PARS in some ways, so this chapter uses these values to reinforce a main takeaway from conversations with study participants: Identify your program values, then build sustainable, agile structures that will last future challenges.

**Keywords:** agile, crisis, learning management systems, program flexibility, responding to change, program strategy, values

In March 2020, most everyone in writing programs got a crash course in teaching writing online.<sup>1</sup> What happened in spring 2020 wasn't typical online writing instruction (OWI)—there wasn't always a clear plan for how lessons would be translated online or how assignments might have to change in a new modality, plus many instructors and programs adjusted their expectations because of the difficulty of the move and the beginning of a global health crisis. The oft-used “emergency remote instruction” acknowledges that hastily moving face-to-face classes and content online isn't the same as carefully planning fully online courses. Still, this shift revealed to writing program administrators (WPAs) how flexible their curricula, programs, and instructors were.

This chapter uses the PARS framework and data from my ongoing dissertation study to examine ways writing programs can adjust their best OWI practices to be more agile in the face of change. Almost two years after the emergency shift to remote teaching, I began my study by asking WPAs to share their reflections from the Spring 2020 semester. In our discussions, participants reflected on “good enough” results, successes, lessons learned, and unexpected opportunities to focus on OWI.

---

1. This study has been approved by Purdue University's Institutional Review Board: IRB-2021-779.

These conversations have led me to think about what I'll call the *agile writing program*: a team of instructors and administrators with consistent practices and principles that make changing curricula or shifting modalities in crisis situations smoother for everyone involved. Some of the WPAs I spoke with were already preparing for these kinds of pivots because March 2020 wasn't their first emergency switch to remote teaching. Others were seeking greater flexibility and agility because the pandemic remained in flux. I ask, *Can writing programs create sufficient infrastructure and cultures of OWI among instructors strong enough to reduce labor, worry, and revision in future pivots?* Alongside these ideas of agility, I began thinking of how Jessie Borgman and Casey McArdle's (2019) PARS (personal, accessible, responsive, strategic) framework could inform this type of writing program development. As more and more parts of the writing process and higher education are digitally mediated, even courses labeled as traditional face-to-face become more entangled with OWI strategies. I realized agility was not only useful during crises but as a key to articulating approaches to improving program sustainability.

The term *Agile* has also gained popularity as a software development strategy that strives to be both flexible and clear about its values. As Susan Lang (2016) describes it, Agile would be useful for rapid and chaotic situations like the ones faced in March 2020 (pp. 82-83). Rebecca Pope-Ruark (2014) has proposed that faculty should engage Agile, finding that "Agile encourages flexibility of mind, responsiveness to change, collaboration with cross-functional team members, and attention to smaller project tasks rather than only end products" (p. 324). For our purposes, I find that the principles of capital-A Agile development can organize thinking about agility in WPA work.

In this chapter, I use Agile software development's four main values to develop practical applications for WPAs based on my discussions with participants. I align Agile with the PARS framework and illustrate how PARS can help shape and direct an agile writing program, in particular because PARS makes similar moves away from procedures to people based on local contexts. Rather than suggesting all programs should implement Agile as a strategy for administration, I want to advocate instead that, like the developers who came up with Agile, *each program clearly articulates their own values* to encourage thinking on our feet without falling over.

## Theory and Practice

### Agile's Values and Our Values

The need for flexible and values-focused writing program administration became clear in March 2020, but for some programs, this wasn't the first pivot. For example, when asked what advice she would give new WPAs, one participant (see participant descriptions in the appendix) responded to encourage having support for

our instructors in a variety of forms, having professional development so that our instructors know how to work technology and how to teach an array of delivery modes, having a flexible enough curriculum, spending the time to invest in curriculum for different delivery modes like online, hybrid, face-to-face—*trying to really create an agile writing program that can respond to changes*. As universities change, as student demographics change, as situations change, trying to do that sets you up for these crisis situations. (“Imelda”)

Another similarly experienced WPA suggested looking at program outcomes *before* making these large decisions for change, calling those outcomes the “North Star” for faculty and administrators as they change courses, programs, and curricula (“Fernand”).

Defining those guiding values to make other processes more flexible was exactly what the Agile developers did when writing their manifesto: As Miriam Posner (2022) describes it, Agile allowed software developers to do the job they were best at while leaving room for quick thinking. Agile, like PARS, provides a stable framework that allows individuals to call on their own expertise.

Posner (2022) acknowledges that Agile has become “corporatized,” noting, “Agile has veered from the original manifesto’s vision, becoming something more restrictive, taxing, and stressful than it was meant to be” (n.p.). Still, Rebecca Pope-Ruark (2022) suggests her idea of Agile Faculty can promote productivity, vitality, well-being, and connection. That is, Agile can still be helpful when thinking about writing programs’ flexibility, as it is “an intentional shift away from the manufacturing mindset of project work to one that is more open to incremental but intentional progress and to a view of humans as the most valuable resource in an organization” (Pope-Ruark, 2017, p. 11). Here, I think through similar processes and ways of prioritizing humans in programs. The original Agile Manifesto succinctly articulates the following priorities:

- **Individuals and interactions** over processes and tools
- **Working software** over comprehensive documentation
- **Customer collaboration** over contract negotiation
- **Responding to change** over following a plan

That is, while there is value in the items on the right, we value the items on the left more (Beck et al., 2001).

It might seem weird to bring Agile into a WPA context, especially when the WPA is often seen as a middle manager (Strickland, 2011) and Agile’s roots are anti-bureaucratic. However, we can see how Borgman and McArdle’s PARS framework for OWI also maps onto Agile’s values: *Individuals and interactions* are personal; *working software* is accessible; *customer collaboration* is responsive; and *responding to change* is strategic. For our purposes, “customers” can serve as both the instructors that WPAs are trying to support through their administrative work and their students, who are directly affected by many of these decisions. Through examining our post-pandemic lessons on WPA work

through Agile, I hope to illustrate how accepting uncertainty and instead centering our own values can make writing programs more (lowercase A) *agile* for changing situations.

### Getting Ready for the Course!

My dissertation study began with a survey sent in fall 2021 to people who were working in writing program administration in March 2020 ( $n=55$ ). This survey was also used to recruit for Phase 2 of my study, a two-part interview series ( $n=13$ ). In the first interview, participants answered general questions about supporting instructors during the emergency switch to remote teaching, with questions partially tailored to survey responses. Later, participants and I examined texts produced by their writing programs during that critical time. Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and de-identified before analysis, and I assigned each participant a pseudonym. Though about half of my Phase 2 participants were tenure-track faculty at larger public institutions, I also had participants who were graduate WPAs and who held non-tenure-track appointments, and participants who worked at smaller public universities, community colleges, and small liberal arts colleges. This study is ongoing, but this chapter uses data from Phase 2, ending in spring 2022.

### Creating Agile Writing Programs

My research has suggested that writing program leaders can make their programs more agile by utilizing the PARS framework as mapped onto the four main values of Agile (see Table 6.1).

**Table 6.1 PARS and Agile**

<b>Personal (P)</b>	Individuals and interactions over processes and tools
<b>Accessible (A)</b>	Working software over comprehensive documentation
<b>Responsive (R)</b>	Customer collaboration over contract negotiation
<b>Strategic (S)</b>	Responding to change over following a plan

#### Personal: Individuals and Interactions Over Processes and Tools

Agile's first value centers people—developers, collaborators, users, customers—over bureaucracy. As we know, the PARS approach also advocates for OWI where instructors and students feel like *real* people having personal interactions. What are some more ways we can apply this to writing program administration?

For many WPAs, an emergency shift to remote teaching meant changing the *processes* of curriculum design to prioritize the *personal* well-being of their

instructors. Designing online courses was already difficult, but designing them with the added exigencies of a pandemic, of student accessibility concerns, of the emotions involved in an uncertain condition, of the isolation brought on by quarantining, of the stress of designing courses in a modality that *many had not taught in before* was, to put it mildly, a lot to handle.

My participants emphasized they believe in academic choice for their instructors and want instructors to design courses in their own personalized ways. However, the *personal* in many cases took precedence over the *personalization*: The labor involved in making big changes on short timelines was, many WPAs felt, unfair. In some cases, union contracts explicitly saw it as a problem. WPAs, then, made curricular revisions themselves or created fully pre-designed courses for instructors to adopt (“Melissa,” “Karen”).

Some programs already had pre-designed courses from previous online summer session offerings. Before their Fall 2020 terms, some prepared shells because of the uncertainty surrounding the pandemic and modalities. In many cases, these pre-designed courses were meant to be adapted for whatever modalities their institutions deemed appropriate during the pandemic—traditional face-to-face, hybrid, remote synchronous, asynchronous.

Being so prescriptive often goes against local departmental cultures. One participant described the reaction to pre-designed courses by saying, “I had a lot of my lecturers angry . . . because, in their mind, it completely trampled on their autonomy and agency as instructors,” but she insisted on that approach given their inexperience teaching online. Notably, many of those instructors came to appreciate pre-designed courses because 1) they realized they were still allowed to adapt them to their teaching, and 2) she likened learning a new course delivery mode to learning a new genre of writing: You usually start by looking at examples (“Melissa”). Another participant noted that a degree of choice—like asking instructors to personalize their own email policies, for example—created conditions for them to set boundaries for self-care (“Rebekah”).

So, what could this mean for OWI going forward?

Borgman and McArdle (2019) explain that the “personal” of PARS in OWI applies to personal design as well as personal instruction in online writing courses. Some of the initial design can still be labor-intensive, so agile WPAs should consider developing strong starting points for instructors to teach online, with resources like repositories and course shells. These can be framed as examples to adapt and learn from, as well as tools that can help instructors save time and energy. At the same time, integrating choice in certain areas such as assignments or communications will be helpful for instructors who need to set boundaries to manage their workload, especially in difficult times.

One approach is the grid described by Allegra Smith et al. (2021), which begins with learning outcomes before offering choices for project ideas suited to those outcomes. Making this kind of backwards design explicit for instructors helps them find options that fit both their priorities as instructors and program

values. Asking instructors to choose between a range of assignment types isn't feasible for every program, however. In these cases, customization options in course shells, for example, can be used by instructors to personalize their virtual offices or upload their own videos and materials.

Douglas Hesse (2012) lists documents that WPAs should keep in their “digital cupboard” (pp. 155-156)—staple materials, like staple ingredients, that should be ready to go for any sudden changes or reporting. I'd like to expand that concept for OWI based on my interviews. WPAs could consider having the following ready:

- At least one course shell in the institution's learning management system (LMS) with modules already created for weeks or units, as makes sense for the course. Programs should have separate shells for separate term lengths (such as 8-week summer courses versus 16-week semester-long courses).
- At least one sample syllabus with areas marked for customization by the instructor. This syllabus can be pre-designed with all necessary language and outcomes included and accessibility already in mind.
- A repository for course materials, which can be borrowed from other instructors, including
  - assignment sheets and rubrics (if instructors design their own, it still helps to build upon examples);
  - sample online activities, such as discussion board prompts or peer review activities;
  - sample course calendars; and
  - course readings external to the textbook that instructors may find useful.

Programs should also seek to make this kind of sharing part of program culture by regularly pointing new instructors to the repository of resources and asking continuing instructors to donate their materials.

### Accessible: Working Software Over Comprehensive Documentation

The necessity of *working software* for accessibility became very apparent during the early days of the pandemic. One participant created guides for instructors based on their comfort levels with teaching online but said that she knew the “novice” level was necessary “Not just for faculty, but for students who didn't have access to high-tech stuff” (“Karen”). In this analogy, *comprehensive documentation*, referring to *recordkeeping of processes that might become unsustainable busywork*, can be translated into providing *multiple, advanced digital tools* for OWI. Comprehensive documentation can lead to better software *and* can hinder the development of better software, and using digital tools in an online course can make the course richer *or* can add too many new skills for students to learn. Online courses open up a number of opportunities for smarter learning software

that we can use with our students for writing, peer review, and interacting in class—but there is also the question of whether all those new tools are *usable* for students and instructors. Hardware and software issues abounded in terms of accessing courses early on in the pandemic—some students joined Zoom sessions from their cars outside coffee shops to access free Wi-Fi. WPAs also realized the ways accessibility needs to be personalized at times. One WPA described an instructor who couldn't look at screens for as long as needed to grade and keep up with students, so the program had to find a printer (“Olga”). At the same time, other accessibility concerns fell by the wayside, as one participant noted:

I honestly think that so many people were just struggling so much that thinking about accessibility, beyond what it took for them to move their courses online, was just above and beyond what they had the bandwidth to do at that point. (“Erin”)

Still, we should take note when software opens up new opportunities for accessibility. One participant was pleasantly surprised that their school's LMS would perform quick accessibility checks on a course site (“Fernand”); another found that their Zoom class sessions were, in some ways, *more* accessible to multilingual students, who could send private messages to clarify what was being said (“Erin”).

So, what could this mean for OWI going forward?

Basic accessibility principles need to be standardized across programs: Instructors need to understand how to make the learning software *work*. According to my survey data (Yerace, 2022), 75 percent of WPAs reported paying special attention to accessibility concerns as they supported instructors in spring 2020, and 89 percent reported providing additional technology support, even though many campuses have some form of IT department already. Borgman and McArdle (2019) discuss having plans in place for when technology fails, but in spring 2020, many IT departments were overwhelmed and not working at full functionality. Having resources already created for instructors to adapt can both alleviate the workload for instructors *and* ensure accessibility concerns are met.

It helps to have a broader understanding of what tools for online courses instructors and students already know. This is part of why technology access surveys became so widely recommended at the start of the pandemic. While we can make assumptions about tech access for students who sign up for online courses, keep in mind that even courses at the same institution may use different tools in addition to the course site.

A culture of accessibility—that is, incorporating accessibility concerns into a program's conversations—is important, but other tools, like quick accessibility checklists for LMS courses and syllabi, will be handy when setting up online courses and when courses suddenly need to pivot.

There's an important nuance here, however. One participant told me she couldn't fault her contingent faculty for not being experts with the school's LMS, as it had recently changed and many of them worked at multiple schools with



different learning management systems (“Chantal”). It may be that WPAs in similar situations should find ways to *incentivize* LMS training, particularly for building online writing courses.

## Responsive: Customer Collaboration Over Contract Negotiation

In Agile, customer collaboration is in line with the move to focus on people over processes. Here, the “customers” make sense as instructors in the program—the people WPAs are trying to support. Any “product” is the resources and tools WPAs make and share among the program, so instructors are important collaborators to make sure that the support they receive is the support they need. Further, considering students as additional “customers” in this analogy (whether we like that language or not) means considering them as potential additional collaborators.

We can see some helpful tools from WPAs who were thinking about this. One, as I said previously, wrote a guide that can be navigated based on the instructor’s comfort level with technology (“Karen”). Another had a green/yellow/red email check-in system with their instructors before the initial migration online, using the codes to keep the check-ins brief; then, when it became clear that emergency remote teaching was going to last longer than their institution first thought, they made sure everyone had a one-on-one chat with someone from the writing program team to see if there were any needs that could be met. For instructors in the program who hadn’t taught online before or indicated they needed extra help, the writing program team made a “mentoring matrix” to determine who would focus help to whom (“Humberto”).

Building OWI infrastructure for a program can be collaborative, too. At least a couple WPAs asked their instructors for modules or course videos to share with the whole program when the emergency shift began, and at least one was able to compensate those instructors for their effort (“Karen”; “Barry”).

So, what could this mean for OWI going forward?

Leverage the strengths of the instructors in your programs, as equitably as you can. Some of this can be done through the repository recommended above, which highlights what instructors do well and alleviates the workload for others. Programs can also highlight the strengths of their staff members: For example, a graduate assistant WPA can be more hands-on with less experienced graduate teaching assistant (GTAs) as a type of strategic mentoring. Borgman and McArdle (2019) write that *personal* administration in writing programs starts with “treating your faculty with respect and acknowledging that they are contributors to the larger field of writing studies,” and *responsive* administration includes explicitly involving non-tenure-track faculty (pp. 27, 63-64); collaborating with faculty to determine the program’s way forward, or to build something like the repository mentioned earlier, means highlighting the contributions that instructors can make to their programs simply with the good work they are already doing.

Writing programs should have continuous modes of assessment—however brief—for thinking about how your program can continue to support your instructors. Programs can also support instructors in assessment of their own courses, opening up collaboration in course design to students.

### Strategic: Responding to Change Over Following a Plan

While you would think the value with the word “responding” would pair with the “responsive” of PARS, I’ve paired it with “strategic” because of the pandemic context. Spring 2020 was a quick change for a lot of instructors, but what came after was at least a year or more of changing or unclear policies for health guidance, educational delivery, and instruction. Although they had to respond to each situation, WPAs quickly realized they needed to *strategize*.

For some, this meant coming up with multiple plans for instruction after spring 2020 based on whether their schools decided on remote synchronous, remote asynchronous, hybrid, or fully face-to-face instruction. As mentioned previously, some of the infrastructure to help instructors start their courses was designed strategically for adaptation to these different situations.

Effective WPAs already think strategically: They leverage the strengths of their instructors and find ways to improve curriculum and support people more equitably. WPAs with teams can think strategically with those different team members. One WPA described getting a grant from the institution to design their online course shell and giving the task to a graduate assistant on the team, paying the student with the grant money to do the work (“Barry”). Another asked their graduate assistant WPA to have one-on-one meetings with other graduate assistants, encouraging peer-to-peer mentoring (“Humberto”).

Not all writing programs have large, dedicated teams, but WPAs still found collaborators for what they needed to do. One described working with a college dean to advocate for different Fall 2020 course modes with the provost (“Chantal”); another collaborated with GTAs in the practicum she led on resources instructors could use (“Karen”).

Other WPAs were able to make lasting changes from the pandemic. At least a few took the opportunity to revise old procedures like assessment measures. One WPA took the opportunity to make an old portfolio system less penalizing and was able to keep the lower-stakes portfolio for future terms (“Olga”). Another was able to move a self-directed placement pilot into a program-wide rule because it was easier to do online (“Fernand”).

Not all lasting changes are tangible: Many WPAs discuss how program cultures have shifted because of the pandemic. One said, “I’m so proud of my faculty that emerged [from the pandemic] with a much more nuanced understanding of their students as people who have lives and responsibilities—and even other classes!—outside of their class” (“Melissa”). These types of lessons are learned in the classroom, but WPAs can take the next step to codify them into values going forward.

So, what could this mean for OWI going forward?

Borgman and McArdle (2019) frame administrative strategy in terms of thinking of student populations: Demographics for online courses are often very different than those for more traditional face-to-face courses (p. 77). Likewise, instructors may be more dispersed, making a communications strategy even more important. This means responding to changes in expectations as we encounter differences in teaching modalities *and* responding to changes in the populations we serve.

The recommendations I make in this chapter are not just small acts but are products of a larger attitude that asks, constantly, *why* we do what we do, in order to make sure we are still achieving our goals. This is why WPAs made progress on getting their instructors more comfortable with teaching online as well as other changes they had wanted to see in their program: Such a crisis prompted them to ask these kinds of questions. Writing programs need to be on the lookout for opportunities to move towards their goals. This falls in line with scholarship we have about strategic WPA thinking: Mike Ristich et al. (2021) describe “archi-strategic decisions” made in the pandemic to determine ways of supporting faculty, with decisions that also outlast the current crisis and work toward a fairer, more sustainable future; Melvin Beavers (2021) uses “administrative rhetorical mindfulness” as a means of faculty development, particularly for part-time faculty.

Continuous assessment of instructors’ strengths and areas for development, especially in terms of online teaching, means that programs can strategize professional development activities that help prepare instructors for sudden changes. As described above, this assessment can be incorporated into existing structures in the writing program. Borgman and McArdle (2019) describe user experience (UX) as part of the “strategic” arm of OWI, and continuous assessment with users (teachers) in mind follows their recommendations on strategy. In the same way, conversations about the direction of the program can become regular ways for staff and instructors to collaborate on development that creates a more agile writing program.

## Conclusion and Takeaways

### Implementing Agile Writing Programs

A discussion of strategy and looking for opportunities to make progress towards our goals leads naturally into, perhaps, the main takeaway of this chapter. Many of these recommendations—talk more about accessibility, have course shells ready, look for opportunities to make good and lasting changes—may seem obvious but become more effective once we first *articulate what, exactly, our values are*. From there, we can begin to think about the *agility* of our writing programs, including their flexibility in the face of large changes and preparation of instructors for different course modalities, more meaningfully. Many of the questions

I am using for this study come from trying to determine how WPAs suggested cuts and changes to curriculum in the face of crisis: How do you decide where you're lowering the stakes, and how do you balance that with a program's goals and outcomes?

However, through these conversations in my study, I realized that this question becomes less complicated *when we know our real priorities*, as one participant articulated for me: "I care about our standards, I care about our outcomes, I care about our pedagogy, but *the reason why I care about all those things is because I care about the faculty and the students* [emphasis added]" ("Olga"). Writing programs, before they involve technology and assignments and learning outcomes, don't work without *people*, and that was illustrated clearly in the early stages of the pandemic. This is, perhaps, why the organization of this chapter falls in line with the Agile Manifesto easily, when the Manifesto was created to reposition software developers as an equally important part of the development process.

Questions of how you redesign a course or a program, or how you design infrastructure that withstands crisis, fall in line with other calls to consider design thinking in composition studies. For example, Jim Purdy (2014) considers design thinking to be oriented forward and recursive (pp. 620, 627). These agile recommendations are not just meant to think about sustainability but are meant to be revisited, strategically, to make sure they are still responsive, accessible, and personalized.

In many programs, the pandemic naturally spurred conversations around how that priority of *people* can be articulated into revised policy. After all, choices made by WPAs during the pandemic often made this priority more explicit: Some WPAs described how their practicum courses for new GTAs became less about teaching and more about checking in with each other ("Dexter"; "Karen"). One participant notes that, among her instructors, "I'm thrilled that right now we're having really hard discussions about attendance. And I think it has everything to do with [the pandemic]. What's important? And what do we value?" ("Melissa"). Many of those who used that moment to make lasting changes had already articulated their eventual goal in some way: Some had been trying to change their assessment procedures and simply saw the opportunity to do so, for example. Others had already considered what the strengths of their team members were and made a commitment to use them.

There are many nuances to pick out of the lessons and successes I've collected here. I've mapped agile concepts with PARS in Table 6.1. And here are a few final points. Design a course shell, but leave room for your instructors' personalization. Use a pre-designed course to teach the new genre of course delivery, but leave it flexible enough to be adapted for other modalities. Highlight the strengths of your team or collaborators, but be conscious of adding to their labor, especially during difficult times. Keep technology simple, but take advantage of its new allowances. Continually assess what your instructors need, but don't create too much more work for them. I can sum this up with my final point: Be *strategic*.

Borgman and McArdle (2019) remind us that strategy is the most fundamental part of OWI: “The most important thing a (novice or experienced) instructor or administrator can do is be strategic about their process” (p. 71). I will reiterate that in order for your program to become more agile, you need to be strategic, responding to change as it comes (Agile), but also, *be strategic and have a plan*—one that highlights your priorities as a writing program, or, in other words, prioritizes treating your people well.

**Table 6.2 PARS and Agile Values in Online Writing Instruction**

PARS Letter	Agile Value	Application for the Future of OWI
Personal (P)	Individuals and interactions over processes and tools	Consider having resources, shells, and samples ready for instructors who may be new to teaching online. Make this kind of sharing part of the program’s culture, so that instructors know they don’t have to start from scratch when shifting modalities of teaching.
Accessible (A)	Working software over comprehensive documentation	Incorporate accessibility into existing resources, as well as add ways of checking for accessibility in different areas and materials for the course. Have an awareness of the limits of teachers and students in terms of learning new software.
Responsive (R)	Customer collaboration over contract negotiation	Identify the strengths of instructors and the writing program team, alongside performing continuous assessment of what instructors are comfortable with and what areas they can continue to learn about. Give instructors ways to self-assess their classes and collaborate with students over course design.
Strategic (S)	Responding to change over following a plan	Hold continuous assessment and discussions of the program’s goals in terms of instructors, teaching modalities, and tools available to teachers and students. Make sure that everything the program does serves a purpose.

## References

- Beavers, M. (2021). Administrative rhetorical mindfulness: A professional development framework for administrators in higher education. *Academic Labor: Research and Artistry*, 5(1). <https://digitalcommons.humboldt.edu/alra/vol5/iss1/9>
- Beck, K., Beedle, M., Bennekum, A., Cockburn, A., Cunningham, W., Fowler, M., Grenning, J., Highsmith, J., Hunt, A., Jeffries, R., Kern, J., Marick, B., Martin, R.,

- Mellor, S., Schwaber, K., Sutherland, J., & Thomas, D. (2001). *Manifesto for Agile software development*. <https://agilemanifesto.org/>
- 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>
- Hesse, D. (2012). Writing program research: Three analytic axes. In M. Sheridan & L. Nickoson (Eds.), *Writing studies research in practice: Methods and methodologies* (pp. 140-157). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Lang, S. M. (2016). Taming big data through agile approaches to instructor training and assessment: Managing ongoing professional development in large first-year writing programs. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 39(2), 81-104. <https://www.wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sp/journal-archives>
- Pope-Ruark, R. (2014). A case for metic intelligence in technical and professional communication programs. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 23(4), 323-340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2014.942469>
- Pope-Ruark, R. (2017). *Agile faculty: Practical strategies for managing research, service, and teaching*. University of Chicago Press.
- Pope-Ruark, R. (2022). *The agile academic*. Rebecca Pope-Ruark. <https://theagileacademic.com/>
- Posner, M. (2022). Agile and the long crisis of software. *Logic Magazine*, 16. <https://logicmag.io/clouds/agile-and-the-long-crisis-of-software/>
- Purdy, J. P. (2014). What can design thinking offer writing studies? *College Composition and Communication*, 65(4), 612-641.
- Ristich, M., McArdle, C., & Rhodes, J. (2021). Assessing the limits of program strategy: “Archi-Strategy” in an age of disruption. *Programmatic Perspectives*, 12(1). [https://cptsc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Ristich-et-al.\\_-Archi-Strategy-perspectives\\_.pdf](https://cptsc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Ristich-et-al._-Archi-Strategy-perspectives_.pdf)
- 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>
- Strickland, D. (2011). *The managerial unconscious in the history of composition studies*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Yerace, M. (2022). New priorities in strange times: How writing programs navigated emergency remote teaching. *Computers & Composition Online*. [http://cconlinejournal.org/dec\\_2022/Yerace/Codedocs/index.html](http://cconlinejournal.org/dec_2022/Yerace/Codedocs/index.html)

## Appendix: Participant Descriptions

*Andrea* is a graduate assistant and doctoral candidate at a public research university with about 17,000 students. She works with the writing across the curriculum (WAC) program at her university.

*Barry* is a tenure-track professor at a flagship state university with about 34,000 students. As of March 2020, he was the director of composition, working with teaching faculty and GTAs, and with at least one graduate assistant on staff. Barry's program had never offered courses online before March 2020.

*Chantal* is a tenure-track professor at a small liberal arts college with about 6,000 students, where she oversees first-year writing, their writing-intensive WAC courses, and is the English department chair.

*Dexter* is a tenure-track professor at a public research university of over 30,000 students. As assistant chair for the department, he oversaw training of new GTAs, including their practicum courses. He works with a staff member, the director of writing, who handles scheduling concerns and other business for the program.

*Erin* is a non-tenure-track professor and writing program administrator at a community college with about 11,000 students and a large Hispanic student population.

*Fernand* is a tenure-track professor and coordinator for the graduation writing assessment requirement, which involves upper-division writing requirements. He works alongside a colleague who oversees the lower-division writing courses.

*Gabrielle* is a tenure-track professor at a regional comprehensive university of about 7,400 students, where she oversees writing-to-learn courses and runs assessment for the first-year writing program.

*Humberto* is a tenure-track professor at a public research university of about 19,000 students. He was the director of the university writing program in 2020 and worked on a team with a teaching faculty associate director, a graduate assistant director, and a permanent staff member.

*Imelda* is a tenure-track professor at a public land-grant research university of over 30,000 students, where she is the director of composition. Her team includes two associate directors, at least one of whom is also a faculty member.

*Karen* was a non-tenure-track professor working at a regional comprehensive institution of about 6,000 students in March 2020. As the writing programs director, she also trained GTAs.

*Melissa* is a tenure-track professor at a public land-grant research university with about 50,000 students. As of March 2020, she was the interim director of the writing program and worked with TAs as part of that role.

*Olga* is a tenure-track professor at a regional comprehensive university of about 21,000 students, where she directs first-year writing.

*Rebekah* is a tenure-track professor who became the associate director of the writing program in the summer of 2020. She works at a public university of about 18,000 students.