

Valuing an Embodied Epistemology to Counter Neoliberal Programmatic Reform at the Two-Year College

Alison Cardinal, Kirsten Higgins, and Anthony Warnke

ABSTRACT: This article heeds Susan Naomi Bernstein’s call for an “embodied epistemology” for Basic Writing. In the wake of recent economic and health crises as well as the ongoing effects of neoliberal reform efforts at the two-year college, a materialist, embodied orientation for critical practitioners within two-year colleges is more necessary than ever. This epistemology foregrounds the local conditions of people, programs, and practices involving Basic Writing and challenges the limitations of the neoliberal reform movement, which has taken hold at many two-year colleges. The reform movement flattens differences among two-year colleges while primarily conceiving of and representing their value in economic, specifically neoliberal, terms. As a result, the initiatives that this movement offers, many of which involve Basic Writing and basic writers, deemphasize local conditions, fail to foreground racial equity, and ignore material concerns that do not fall within a neoliberal framework. An embodied epistemology, therefore, helps critical practitioners locate areas for transformative action within their programs and in the larger scope of their institutions. Drawing on examples from one specific two-year college ecology, this article details how an embodied epistemology can negotiate reforms as well as take actions on issues that are marginal in the reform movement. Among other concerns, the article addresses reforming course placement; adapting a corequisite approach to Basic Writing through an equity lens; attending to the affective in corequisite support courses and deemphasizing the individualistic notion of “non-cognitive” support; and detailing larger institutional actions that materially impacts basic writers. Through these examples, the article offers an embodied epistemology as a proactive alternative to neoliberal hegemony.

KEYWORDS: Accelerated Learning Program; ALP; Basic Writing; embodiment; epistemology; two-year college; neoliberalism; writing program reform

Alison Cardinal is Assistant Professor in Writing Studies at the University of Washington Tacoma. Her research expertise lies at the intersection of participatory and visual research methods in academic and community settings, community-based literacy studies, and social justice approaches to UX. Her work has appeared or is forthcoming in *Computers and Composition*, *Composition Forum*, *Communication Design Quarterly*, *Technical Communication Quarterly*, and multiple edited collections. She received both the 2020 Hugh Burns Best Dissertation Award and the Ellen Nold Best Article from *Computers and Composition*.

This article arises at an unsettling and uncertain moment for two-year colleges. With declining enrollment (National Student Clearinghouse) and the disinvestment in higher education, it's more challenging than ever to maintain the egalitarian dream of the two-year college (TYC). Though these trends pre-date the pandemic, the pandemic has further exacerbated existing fissures. Adjunct faculty bear the brunt of losses from reduced course offerings as job cuts fall on the most precarious workers. BIPOC communities, disrupted in their educational plans, face widening equity gaps (Belfield and Brock). State-mandated initiatives threaten faculty autonomy and reduce higher education to its economic value. Though seemingly intractable, these fissures also open up space for locally situated action within the unsettled and unsettling landscape. If there is anything that Basic Writing (BW) scholarship has shown us, it's that we can maintain hope that change is possible in the face of difficult circumstances. How, then, can teacher-scholar-activists assert their agency despite destabilizing forces that relentlessly threaten and devalue open-access education? (Sullivan).

This article situates these forces within the neoliberal circumscription of higher education—where market logic and economic values guide many state legislatures, administrators, and research centers. The so-called reform movement at two-year colleges has arisen in this neoliberal context. Institutions, chasing after grant funding and the need to stay in the black, are increasingly making curricular and programmatic decisions to reform without consulting faculty experts. State-mandated reforms such as streamlining developmental education and implementing Guided Pathways continue to offer corporately underwritten and broadly replicated remedies for transforming two-year colleges into stronger economic performers in the face of crises. It has become commonplace for an institution to accept funding from a philanthropic entrepreneurial organization—like the Gates Foundation—that requires TYC faculty to reform programs and practices. Consequently, a faculty member might open their inbox to discover that their college and/or the state are specifically targeting their programs. While

Kirsten Higgins and **Anthony Warnke** teach writing at Green River College in Auburn, Washington. As co-writing program administrators, they helped design an equity-focused Accelerated Learning Program to revamp their department's developmental English sequence. Their scholarship has appeared in or is forthcoming from *The Basic Writing e-Journal*, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, as well as edited collections on autoethnography in corequisite courses and emotional labor in writing program administration. Their article "A Critical Time for Reform: Interventions in a Precarious Landscape" was selected for the *Parlor Press* anthology *Best of the Rhetoric and Composition Journals* 2019.

programmatic changes are at times needed, these top-down mandates often do not offer a nuanced understanding of a particular locale's student needs. And rarely, if ever, do these mandates hold any regard for the well-being of part-time faculty who teach many of those courses. Couched in the vague language of "innovation" and "student success," these mandates reshape the purpose of open-access institutions—who they are for, what they should look like, and who ultimately should have control. It can feel like these neoliberal forces sweep the TYC forward and faculty are left with little choice but to be reactive. Teacher-scholar-activists need new analytical tools that can be used to understand one's context and find openings for responsive work within the reform context in the neoliberal moment.

In this article, we offer a combination of theory and practice, or praxis, for identifying opportunities for responsive work. We take this approach partly due to the emergence of the term *teacher-scholar-activist* in TYC writing scholarship, which defines the nature of the work as an inseparable combination of theory, practice, and social justice-oriented action (Sullivan). As such, this article is neither a purely theoretical piece nor solely a description of programmatic reform. Instead, we seek to strongly link theory and practice as essential partners in on-the-ground activism. For our purposes, we believe a strong theoretical understanding of the current neoliberal moment and how it constructs knowledge and shapes realities is essential. While no two institutions are the same, we hope that our local application will resonate and can better highlight the way neoliberalism emerges materially and locally.

To equip teacher-scholar-activists, this article has two specific goals: 1) To define an *embodied epistemology* as it relates to two-year colleges today (Bernstein). Those doing critical reform work need this approach, first conceived of by Susan Naomi Bernstein, which situates the discipline of BW and its tradition of attending to those on the margins within the lived realities of the current moment. This method attends to the complexity and specificity of a college's local context and refuses to eschew material and political concerns. 2) To detail what it looks like to put this theory in practice by describing how a group of TYC faculty used this praxis to reform their BW program. Our account highlights how, despite the ways philanthropic entrepreneurial organizations frame reform, we were able to resist the neoliberal frame in small but effective ways.

By using an embodied epistemology, we were able to find places for activism within the messy complexity. This article, therefore, highlights specific examples of programmatic change while showing how theory has guided those changes. Our goal is to demonstrate the effectiveness of this

approach and show how an embodied epistemology can be used at other institutions looking to maintain the integrity of the TYC's original mission and redirect the direction of austerity measures. By reforming BW programs via this approach, writing faculty can actively resist the pull to define students and their experiences only by their economic value to the TYC and can redirect mandated reform of writing programs by using the opportunity to progressively reshape the structure, curriculum, placement mechanisms, and labor configurations. This emphasis on praxis acknowledges the opportunities in the current moment for reforms that can, broadly, support student success and, more specifically, trouble longstanding practices and ideologies about basic writers. However, the complexity of these reforms and, in particular, the top-down implementation and neoliberal funding sources require engaging with them in light of the local populations they affect. This requires faculty to be nimble, responsive, and unabashedly anti-neoliberal in the application of this theoretical framework. Our goal is to equip faculty—theoretically and practically—for this challenging work.

THE NEED FOR NEW EPISTEMOLOGIES

One of the most important terms in our argument is *epistemology*, which we think is necessary to carefully define. This term most simply refers to a “way of knowing” (Powell and Takayoshi), but it has many associated terms. These include paradigm, worldview, theoretical framework and philosophy (Creswell, Merriam). Explicitly or implicitly, an epistemology informs every scholar's work as well as their own positionalities. Feminist approaches in Writing Studies urge researchers to critically examine our epistemologies and make them visible in the work that we do (Powell and Takayoshi; Royster and Kirsch; Rawson and Schell). For this article, we will use the term *epistemology* to refer to:

- The framework that researchers and policymakers use to understand a phenomenon
- What and who this framework values
- The way this framework drives the questions and concerns of instructors, researchers, and policymakers
- How this philosophical framework motivates action (Creswell)

We want to acknowledge that this term is slippery and has overlap with methodology (philosophy of research). While we acknowledge this slippage, we use epistemology because it encompasses broader concerns

than just research, such as an institution's overall philosophical paradigm that guides all of its operations.

While there is already a large body of work that outlines the types of worldviews used in composition studies writ large (Harris; Barnard; Berlin; Faigley), our descriptions of epistemologies will focus on those developed and used in the study and teaching of Basic Writing. BW, from the beginning as a discipline and a practice in the 1970s, was politically motivated, and two-year college scholars were involved in vital documents such as the original Student's Right to Their Own Language (Toth). At the birth of the open-access movement, BW scholars were motivated to help those who had been excluded from higher education. While this radical framework has always motivated the discipline, the objects of study and major concerns have shifted over time. A large initial focus put "basic writers" as the subjects of study to define these students and try to understand their language and writing practices (Ritter; Sternglass). Scholars became critical of these discourses of students as "basic writers" as infantilizing, romanticizing and deficit-based (Horner and Lu; Stanley; Stygall). A large body of scholarship has focused attention on Basic Writing programs themselves, and how these structures help or hinder student success (McNenny and Fitzgerald; Grego and Thompson; Adams et al.), with some calling for the abolition of Basic Writing programs altogether (Shor).

While these approaches have been immensely helpful for critically examining the "basic writer" and what a Basic Writing program should look like, as well as the consequences of both, there has been less focus on frameworks that zoom out to a broader picture of writing's entanglement in the specific contexts of two-year colleges, their communities, and their places among institutional and labor ecologies (LaFrance; Soliday; Toth *Transfer*). And while much of the scholarship on Basic Writing has been used to develop and reform writing programs and develop critical pedagogies, the discipline could benefit from epistemologies that mobilize not just disciplinary knowledge but also local ways of knowing and local needs. BW at the two-year college would also benefit from a more expansive field of analysis beyond writers and writing programs to provide the basis for more transformative political action at a college and within the community. We argue that when teacher-scholar-activists research their context and look for places to intervene, they should take account of the materialist, ecological and embodied nature of the two-year college landscape to provide the foundation for activism.

In the past 15 years, ecological and materialist epistemologies in composition studies have challenged static conceptions of writing that ignore the embodied and material relations in which writing and rhetoric lives (Cooper; Dobrin; Horner; Schell; Ratcliffe). These frameworks understand writing as emplaced in complex networks and dynamic relationships where everyday people and writing practices mutually shape one another. However, as Reiff et al. argue, “We talk about the complexity of writing in our scholarly journals, we postulate theories of writing as ecological, complex, dynamic, and interrelational, and yet when it comes to the programs we help to create and maintain in our universities and other sites of practice, we have difficulty seeing them in the same ecological light” (4). In the context of the two-year college and Basic Writing, this is equally true. Despite the fact that broader activist movements provided the foundation in many ways for Basic Writing’s existence at CUNY and beyond (Biondi), ecological understandings of BW’s place amid larger political forces in the two-year college are less prominent than they should be.

In BW scholarship, books that examine the institutional role of BW largely base their analysis on the discourses surrounding these programs. These works often base their archival research on institutional documents (Ritter; Lamos; Stanley) and written accounts (Soliday). While this research is immensely helpful for historicizing Basic Writing and uncovering its origins within open-access institutions, as well as for detailing how discourses around Basic Writing and basic writers shape programs and student trajectories, there is a need for more methods that examine the immediate contexts and current material practices happening in the complex political and economic moment. Landscapes are constantly in a state of flux, and TYC faculty would benefit from methods and epistemologies that privilege their knowledge and experiences on the ground as well as their allegiances and values that exist outside of a neoliberal understanding. These include qualitative methods that emphasize the lived and embodied nature of teaching and learning. For instance, we suggest that conducting institutional ethnographic studies can be effective to understand the neoliberal landscape of a particular TYC and to find places for action. Another key strategy is gathering the stories of those most affected by neoliberalism, including adjunct faculty and underrepresented students. We suggest engaging underrepresented students in creating counterstories that highlight their experiences (Martinez) and engaging adjunct faculty and students in autoethnographic research (Warnke, Higgins, and Sims; Cardinal, Atienza,

and Jones). We will highlight how some of these methods look in action in the programmatic reform section.

The field is already beginning to make an empirical shift towards paying attention to the immediate, embodied entanglements that make up the work of composition. As Michelle LaFrance argues in her book advocating for institutional ethnographic methods in composition studies, “*much of our field’s discourse elides concern for what people are actually doing, how they are doing it, and how they are enabled to do it*” (14, emphasis original). In two-year college scholarship, Christie Toth begins to widen the analytical frame further by arguing that we should be looking at the ecologies that exist between two-year colleges and universities. Critiquing composition studies’ normative definitions of disciplinarity and how it centers composition at elite institutions, Toth argues that “[t]wo-year college composition must be understood on its own terms rather than through university-centric lenses” (*Transfer*, 77). This lens points to the need for using methodologies and methods especially developed for use at open-access institutions where immediate action is necessary for responding to myriad, shifting forces. It’s important that these epistemologies help to see and untangle the macro, mezzo, and the micro—e.g., the national, state, and local—levels. As two-year colleges continue to be centered as economic engines, many government policies and non-profit organizations are competing to shape the future of TYCs, and by extension, to shape the evolution of BW at these institutions. Neoliberalism and austerity are inextricably entangled in the everyday teaching of Basic Writing. Without an embodied epistemology that can analyze, challenge, and attempt to hold all these forces in balance, teacher-scholar-activists are left with the unproductive polarity of resistance or compliance that makes a critical reform position untenable (Warnke and Higgins).

THE HEGEMONY OF NEOLIBERAL EPISTEMOLOGY

An embodied epistemology must resist the hegemony of neoliberal epistemology where “neoliberalism governs as sophisticated common sense, a reality principle remaking institutions and human beings everywhere it settles, nestles, and gains affirmation” (Brown 35). Neoliberalism itself is a broad term that describes the augmentation and near deification of the “free market” through government policy since the mid-1970s. In neoliberalism, the non-economic value of public goods and spaces is diminished, and “there is no society,” as Margaret Thatcher famously said. Instead, what’s “public” has value insofar as it generates capital, promotes economic gain,

and operates within the logic of the free market. Furthermore, neoliberalism has a more pervasive and pernicious effect than merely privileging a set of economic imperatives. As Wendy Brown argues, neoliberalism transforms every individual into *homo oeconomicus*. In other words, neoliberalism has become a hegemonic rationality and epistemology—not just a dominant economic system—“through which capitalism finally swallows humanity” and marketizes all aspects of private and public life (44). In the two-year college context, state governments, research centers, philanthropic organizations, and institutional leadership increasingly operate from this reality principle, or hegemony, of neoliberal epistemology. Often in the name of liberal ideals, such as upward socioeconomic mobility, neoliberal epistemology circumscribes knowledge, values, and possibilities within two-year colleges. (For example, as we write this, the banner article on the Community College Research Center website reads: “Data Viz: How Much are Community College Graduates Making Two Years Later?”). We would assert that the problem with the hegemony of neoliberal epistemology isn’t that it attends to the economic among other values. Rather, for organizations like CCRC, all roads seem to lead back to economic rationale and students maximizing their value. Issues such as labor inequality and resource availability are of little to no concern. As many scholars have detailed. Such valuing is not a new phenomenon; two-year colleges have long been reduced to their economic utility (Sullivan; Beach). In his critical discourse analysis of community college mission statements in 2005, for example, David Ayers discusses the hegemony of neoliberalism within two-year colleges by analyzing college mission statements.

We, therefore, are extending the work of these scholars to the current moment. The lines of inquiry that follow from neoliberal epistemology include but are not limited to:

- To what extent can two-year colleges be engines of socio-economic mobility? How do two-year colleges serve macroeconomic goals?
- How can two-year colleges serve the economic motivations of students, which is positioned as their primary educational purpose?
- How do metrics such as degree completion represent a college’s success and reflect accountability narratives? (See Toth, Sullivan, and Calhoun-Dillahunt)
- What is the return on investment for investing resources into two-year colleges? How can these investments be made as efficiently as possible—i.e., how can narrow economic framing justify austerity?

In particular, we join scholars who see the way neoliberalism undermines democratic and non-economic roles of higher education as especially relevant to Basic Writing (Stone and Austin; Welch and Scott) and scholarship on the two-year college (Sullivan; Toth). (For more on the relationship between neoliberalism and Basic Writing, see issue 16.1 of the *Basic Writing eJournal*). Part of doing so means interrogating the binaries that cast neoliberalism as the stark opposite of the true purpose of higher education, particularly as it relates to the “people’s college” (Kabat). These dichotomies risk missing the complexities of how neoliberal epistemologies operate and dominate. Part of what makes neoliberal hegemony so durable is the way that it *appropriates* liberal values. This, again, suggests the dominance yet invisibility of the neoliberal reality principle, even for those with the best of intentions. Neoliberal epistemologies, particularly in the context of higher education, often justify themselves through discourses of access, equity, and social justice.

The issue of antiracism provides one example. Critical work by BIPOC scholars questions the performance of antiracism in institutions of higher education. This work offers lessons in the ways that neoliberal epistemologies co-opt and rhetorically enact principles of social justice while ignoring questions of systemic and material change. As Jennifer Hamer and Clarence Lang argue, “the university has become a site where nominally antiracist discourses recognizing diversity, celebrating difference, and even acknowledging the presence of social inequality can thrive—even as unequal distributions of power, resources, and opportunity remain relatively undisturbed” (898). To illustrate the disconnect between rhetoric and resource distribution, Hamer and Lang describe the disproportionate harm of loan debt on African American students, the scarcity of investment in campus resources that support the mental-health needs of African American students, and the lack of full-time faculty of color. We see a similar scarcity of investment within the reform movement at two-year colleges. This is not to say that reformers do not recognize inequity and inequality. However, as Hamer and Lang suggest, a neoliberal epistemology often fails to account for deeper and locally specific questions of power, resource allocation, and opportunity distribution. At worst, it ventriloquizes equity and justice without investing in those who are most vulnerable while tying any investment to economic accountability.

At best, however, we believe at least partial, and perhaps provisional, materially consequential change is possible at this moment. When the reform movement does afford possibilities, we have argued elsewhere that interest convergence can lead to pragmatic negotiations of reform initia-

tives such as changing placement mechanisms or rethinking labyrinthine developmental course sequences (Cardinal and Keown; Warnke and Higgins). Outlining an embodied epistemology for Basic Writing at the two-year college offers an alternative framework that goes beyond critique and looks to effecting pragmatic material change.

EMBODIED EPISTEMOLOGY AS ALTERNATE FRAMEWORK

An embodied epistemology contrasts to the hegemonic neoliberal epistemology that takes advantage of crises to cut and reshape the two-year college within a capitalist framework. It reflects a “located agency” that aligns Basic Writing with those on the margins (Jensen and Suh). In the wake of the Great Recession and in the zeitgeist of Occupy Wall Street, Bernstein argues that “a better world is possible for Basic Writing,” one that “needs a revised epistemology, ways of and means of knowing based on material realities and embodied events of everyday life in the wake of austerity” (104). As institutions, philanthropic organizations, and federal funds compete to define what defines this “better world,” we can demand that we critically examine whose world is actually made better. When working to sustain the ecology of the two-year college within the current political moment, an embodied epistemology challenges or, at least, complicates the lines of inquiry articulated above with questions like:

- How do we recognize the specificity of local conditions and take into account the diversity of local two-year college ecologies, especially when considering reforms?
- In what ways do reforms account for, ignore and/or reify a stratified labor system?
- In what ways can reforms recognize racial disparities unique to local ecologies and be adapted and assessed through their antiracist consequences?
- How does assessment move beyond the narrow metrics of “accountability,” resisting what Toth, Sullivan, and Calhoun-Dillahunt call “notions of educational accountability [that] theorize students as wholly independent ‘consumers,’ unattached to and unaffected by historical backgrounds, families, communities, cultures, and structures of social inequality”? (401)
- To what extent does the two-year college preserve roles for democratic and liberal arts values in higher education, especially for those most underserved and often reduced to the benefits of vo-

cational education? Relatedly, how can we conceive of the *whole* student and the dynamic intersections of their identities and dreams as well as their physical and emotional needs?

- How can we acknowledge the insufficiency of any neoliberal reform to address the larger political struggles that manifest in our ecologies such as poverty and white supremacy? And how do we hold onto critical reflection on reforms once they have been implemented?

When orienting BW to everyday material realities, Bernstein argues that “we must write and must speak—we must bear witness to austerity and we must recognize human suffering...” (103). An embodied epistemology in the two-year college must, therefore, work to alleviate material suffering that neoliberal hegemony marginalizes or pays lip service to. As Bernstein describes her experience with Occupy Wall Street, she insists that BW scholars take up and reclaim space. The students who occupied the library at CUNY knew the power of reclaiming space and embodying it in a way that demanded attention. It was their radical act that led to the open-access institution. Neoliberal epistemologies, with their positivist bent, ignore the qualitative and privilege “big data” that can lead to reforming the TYC. Embodied epistemologies claim the opposite. They elevate storytelling, witnessing, and autoethnographic work as a way to speak back to the narrowness of “objectivity” (Baker-Bell; Chang; Martinez). By centralizing the qualitative, we also centralize the experience of the most marginalized and keep those at the center accountable and reflexive about their positionality and privilege (hooks). As Shari Stenberg argues, “the margins offer a keener view of dominant structures and that articulating located, embodied knowledge is both a channel to illuminate epistemological possibilities and to take responsibility for the partiality of one’s perspective” (193). Neoliberal power structures remain invisible at the center, and those working at the margins provide a powerful potential to critique and take action against them.

An embodied epistemology’s lines of inquiry resist the reduction of the two-year college to market utility. Yet they also acknowledge that two-year colleges have always existed within complicated entanglements. To enact an embodied epistemology means recognizing the political messiness that has long shaped the two-year college while moving forward with materially consequential actions. Scholars have extensively documented the contradictory nature of the two-year college, and they have robustly critiqued it for cooling aspirations and purporting to offer access when, in

fact, they reproduce stratification (Clark; Beach; Dougherty). An embodied epistemology towards Basic Writing means occupying this messy, relational, even contradictory web within the two-year college.

The following examples illustrate how, when an embodied epistemology is combined with activism, this praxis can lead to change within the two-year college. Our examples begin on the programmatic level as we discuss placement and redesigning our Basic Writing program. Then, we explain how an embodied epistemology can result in change in institutional spaces beyond Basic Writing programs themselves.

EMBODIED EPISTEMOLOGIES IN A LOCAL CONTEXT

Rethinking Standardized Placement

As an example, we will describe how, through the use of a combination of institutional ethnography (LaFrance) and storytelling work, we were able to use the gathered data to reform placement into Basic Writing courses to materially improve the lives of students. At our two-year college—a large, suburban, and diverse two-year college between Seattle and Tacoma—Warnke and Higgins saw an opportunity for better serving the material interests of our students through questioning their placement within our multiple-level Basic Writing and developmental reading program. Rethinking course placement meant analyzing the reductive and dehumanizing effects of standardized placement mechanisms such as the Compass exam. Part of this work involved critically examining the racist and classist language ideologies present in the Compass exam questions and timed format. We saw overlap between Community College Research Center scholarship calling for placement reforms with disciplinary-specific scholarship calling for the replacement of high-stakes, standardized placement assessments (Toth, “Directed”; Inoue).

Our process for reforming placement began by including a variety of stakeholders within our division to gather data and make decisions based on what emerged. We created an inclusive divisional subcommittee rather than a top-down, administratively driven process. This subcommittee included both composition and reading faculty since placement had impacts on various elements of our ecology. Finally, gathering quantitative institutional data helped to highlight the disparate impact (Poe et al.) on our student population, particularly on our increasing number of international students. We centralized race in our data gathering to emphasize the disproportionate

harms of standardized placement on non-white students, those who were most vulnerable within our ecology but subjugated through normative placement practices.

Throughout our work, we attempted to develop an approach attuned to the complexities within our ecology. We synthesized scholarship, our faculty members' different disciplinary perspectives, and the stories of students' experiences. Conversations around reforming placement could certainly be difficult, especially because changing placement could affect enrollment in Basic Writing courses. However, we attempted (not always successfully) to move through these conversations sensitively and democratically, aware of the vulnerability that changing placement represented. Over the course of two years, the division managed to implement a matrix of placement options. Many members of the division worked together to consider various populations within the ecology and began implementing multiple placement methods such as high school transcript placement and Directed Self-Placement that honored this heterogeneity of experiences and backgrounds (Klausman et al.). Multiple placement measures enact an embodied epistemology in the way they privilege student agency, affirm students' previous experiences, and deemphasize language correctness as predictive of success in the college writing classroom. Taken together, our work on placement began to rethink our Basic Writing program through the ways that students were initially constructed within it. A neoliberal epistemology may have emphasized changes to placement, and certainly we undertook changes to placement, in part, because of the convergence with neoliberal organizations' interest and scholarship on placement. However, a purely neoliberal framework regarding placement would not have valued a democratic, instructor-driven approach for implementing those changes, analyzed those changes through the lens of disparate impact, nor carefully designed a DSP tool where students' experiences and linguistic backgrounds were the basis for their self-assessment.

Designing a Locally Responsive Accelerated Learning Program

The embodied praxis we used in our placement redesign led to seeing more opportunities for antiracist and labor activism amid reform. In particular, we asked to what extent our multiple-course "developmental" writing and reading structure resulted in cooling out the aspirations of our students (Clark). To us, the Accelerated Learning Program reflected progressive calls in Basic Writing for mainstreaming writers (Adams et al.; Shor). We also

found convincing evidence of its effectiveness as two-year colleges across the country adopted it. However, we also felt uneasy with the assimilationist paradigm that we saw reflected in the language ideology of ALP. That untroubled ideology suggested that students should aspire to the Standard Written English ideal of a first-year writing course, and that the corequisite structure of ALP would help them do so more easily. We saw this ideology, for example, in materials for ALP's support course that focused on supplemental grammar instruction. More tellingly, perhaps, was how we couldn't find any discussion of multi/translingual student populations on the ALP website or in ALP scholarship. Since then, we have seen how instructors have innovated culturally responsive curriculum. However, as we attempted to adopt this reform, we didn't notice any ways that the corequisite was a vehicle for embodying progressive pedagogy through its mainstreaming of basic writers. Instead, ALP left monolingual and racialized linguistic norms untroubled.

In fact, many developmental reforms, such as ALP, seemed disconnected from the demographics of local contexts. The portability and adaptability of these reforms appeared to be among their principal selling points. Structurally, we believed that combining English 101 with a 3-credit support course made sense for our students. Pedagogically, however, we felt that the discourse around ALP assumed a white, middle-class target. Embodying ALP within our ecology meant recognizing that many of our students, particularly students who would place into ALP, were not white or middle class. Furthermore, as white, middle-class faculty working on this reform, we wanted to use ALP to reflect on our own limited knowledge of students' identities, competencies, and linguistic repertoires. We sought to adapt ALP in light of our student population and their assets. With the ALP model's and our own personal limitations in mind, we used ALP as a vehicle for implementing translingual and antiracist pedagogy that was responsive to our student body. Therefore, we adapted an equity-focused ALP that placed issues of identity at the center of our course. And in our assignments, we attempted to deemphasize "correct" Standard English as the hallmark of a successful college writer (Condon and Young; Perryman-Clark, Kirkland, and Jackson). We took the reform of ALP, with its demonstrated successes, and modified it through an embodied epistemology regarding our student population. We sought to recenter the ways of knowing and writing usually centered in a course that often relies on an unquestioned centering of White Mainstream English. Embodying ALP within the ecology of our ecology involved several areas:

1. *Course texts*: By focusing the course on social and personal identity, we sought to present students with authors from various disciplinary and identity backgrounds. This diversity, we felt, was a first step for repositioning authority and knowledge-making in the classroom. We chose texts that dealt with material concerns on topics such as social power and inequality and poverty. These included texts such as Beverly Tatum's "Who Am I? The Complexity of Identity" and Paul Gorski's "The Myth of the Culture of Poverty." For us, it was important that what students read about, and who they read it from, embodied their own experiences and identities.
2. *Autoethnography*: As we have documented elsewhere, one of the major assignments in the 101 component of our ALP course was an autoethnography assignment (Higgins, Warnke, Sims). In this assignment, we encouraged students to examine their identity construction in an analytic autoethnography. While being aware of our limitations as white instructors soliciting identity disclosures from a diverse student body, we believed autoethnography could center student experiences and literacies in the college writing classroom. This assignment allows students to take a first-person perspective on issues such as race, gender, migration, and mental health. Additionally, this assignment allows students to "codemesh" and bring their own linguistic repertoires into the first-year writing classroom (Canagarajah; Young et al.).
3. *Professional development*: We created a summer institute for teaching ALP that many adjunct faculty members attended. We insisted to our administration that in order to run the institute, and to run more sections of ALP, adjunct faculty members had to be compensated. The insistence on well-compensated professional development attempted to place ALP pedagogy within progressive writing studies scholarship. Such scholarship guided the institute and included work on mainstreaming Basic Writing and translanguaging. Additionally, we attempted to make scaling up ALP, an institutional prerogative, contingent on institutional investment in adjunct instructors. Since we developed this institute, adjunct instructors have become the majority of ALP instructors, and we continue dialoguing among all ALP instructors about our experiences.

4. *Assessment:* Although our college's institutional research office has provided challenges for assessing ALP, we have attempted to assess it through an equity lens. To do this, Higgins and Warnke centered student voices, used student work to promote equity-focused professional development of faculty, and sought quantitative data that examines pass rates for marginalized students. In faculty development workshops, faculty read student essays together not to judge writing but instead to promote conversations about developing practices that integrated antiracist pedagogies within ALP. While we found a significant increase in pass rates, we also wanted to understand whether ALP is resulting in equitable outcomes across marginalized groups. While detailed data that disaggregate by demographic have not been made available to us, the college has embraced ALP as a mechanism for ensuring that fewer students, including students of color, languish in lengthy pre-college pipelines. In fact, our accreditation self-study report singled out ALP and our college's IRW structures as equity-centered reforms. Furthermore, we ran several focus groups to account for student experiences in our piloted sections of ALP. This qualitative data attempted to meaningfully inquire into what students learned and how the course model was (and was not) serving their needs. Our goal was to understand the nuances of student struggles through academic, material, and demographic lenses.
5. *Rethinking Support in the Context of the "Non-Cognitive" Support Course:* The support class in ALP uses the frame of "non-cognitive" for describing how to support students (Adams et al.), which our version of ALP seeks to problematize. This term often stands in for study skills such as time management and goal setting. First, the term "non-cognitive" suggests a problematic binary between academic intelligence and students' daily lives (which don't involve cognition. . .?). Although assisting students with individual skills can help them succeed, this kind of support often neglects material and systemic barriers to student success. "Non-cognitive" support often relies on a "bootstraps" or "grit" narrative that individualizes success or failure. This terminology suggests that the support class should help students develop their inner resources to contend with barriers without recognizing the racist, sexist, ableist, and classist nature of many of those barriers.

ers. For example, a “non-cognitive” support class might include a unit on procrastination without recognizing the gendered nature of a student’s personal responsibilities that might impede them, racist experiences that have damaged their educational self-regard, and/or the role of neurodivergence in procrastination.

To an extent, we understand the value of helping students recognize and develop strategies for success. However, a narrowly conceived “non-cognitive” support class complements neoliberal epistemology. Attention to the individual’s success and productivity aligns with the neoliberal imperative to maximize and “responsibilize” the individual’s success regardless of material constraints and inequities. As Brown argues, “[R]esponsibilized individuals are required to provide for themselves in the context of power and contingencies radically limiting their ability to do so” (134). “Non-cognitive” supports neglect material reasons that students might not succeed such as family obligations, housing or food insecurity, mental health difficulties, and employment issues. In designing more embodied supports for the ALP support course, we attempted to focus on providing resources that would promote student success. In our support sections, we have integrated counseling, campus resource guides, campus tutoring centers, as well as finding and completing scholarships. Furthermore, following the democratic values of studio models, we have used the support class as a “third space” for students to ask questions, drive the content of the class, and share knowledge and resources with one another and their instructor (Grego and Thompson). Most recently, we have experimented with bringing in mindfulness strategies into the support class. These strategies attend to the affective components of learning and include journaling, guided meditation, and bringing awareness to feelings such as anxiety around academic performance. We also use contract grading in the support class to value students’ labor and efforts rather than performance (Inoue). Recognizing that we need students to think about how grades can perpetuate inequality institutionally, we use conversations around grades to help students develop a critical lens towards the structures of the institution to advocate for themselves and others throughout their academic careers.

Based on what we learned from students in ALP, we pushed these conversations beyond the classroom to advocate for students' material needs. Whenever ALP is used as a model of success by colleagues and administrators, we use this as an opportunity to advocate for the resources students need beyond academic support in one course sequence. We look to initiatives such as CUNY's Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) for the ways in which it provides material supports for students such as tuition help and free public transportation passes. However, we have faced resistance at our college for implementing these material supports, but we continue to find every opportunity to advocate for students in these ways.

6. *Adapting ALP for Online Learning:* Most recently, the COVID-19 pandemic has given our local troupe of ALP instructors the opportunity to quickly adapt our courses to try out asynchronous and synchronous instruction. While the impetus for adapting to all online instruction had a tragic origin, it allowed for rethinking how ALP could be embodied in virtual spaces, which led to innovations in offering support online (online ALP). This included using Zoom conferences to work within students' schedules. Instructors' dedication to making ALP successful in a virtual format for diverse learners speaks to their interest in students' well-being. In many cases, instructors developed curriculum around mindfulness approaches or integrated self-care into assignments. In every class, compassion became the watchword for decisions on the number and types of assignments. In addition, instructors instituted design principles that emphasized limiting the number and types of assignments required because of the barriers related to ongoing, robust, uninterrupted internet access while the majority of adults and children in the area were working or studying online. Instructors also negotiated assignment modalities to ensure that students would have the most robust opportunities for demonstrating their ability to meet outcomes (Elliot).

REFLECTING ON COMPLICATED RESULTS

Lack of Systemic Transformation

Part of an embodied epistemology is being reflexive about the actual impact of reforms, rather than only being attuned to intent. Five years after we first piloted ALP at our institution, what we can say is this: It's complicated. We can demonstrate some basic successes. More students, especially students of color, are enrolling directly into a college-level composition course, and pass rates for the college-level courses remain about the same. Further, we have no evidence that students who complete ALP 101 are less likely to pass the next course in the sequence. While the reform has been effective in these limited ways, it's hardly been a slam dunk for closing equity gaps, especially as they persist in programs beyond our influence. We maintain that evidence-based, small-scale reforms such as ALP were pragmatically preferable to leaving the status quo untouched five years ago. An embodied epistemology allowed us to recognize the potential of these reforms by localizing widely adopted initiatives that have roots in both neoliberal reform organizations but also BW scholarship. As they were designed to do, ALP and its typically concomitant placement reforms allow students who would normally be shunted into lengthy developmental English sequences to enroll in college-level English with support. In most cases, course pass rates (or course completion rates, in some research) remain about the same despite the widening of the gates, so more students try—and succeed in—college-level English. However, ALP, at our college and other colleges, has not resulted in systemic transformations that decisively close equity gaps in course completion, much less graduation. (See especially Barnett et al.'s CAPR report, "Who Should Take College-Level Courses? Impact Findings From an Evaluation of a Multiple Measures Assessment Strategy" on mainstreaming's positive but hardly game-changing impacts.) In fact, most developmental reforms have some success in getting students to hit early success markers, such as accumulation of college level credits or enrollment in the next sequential course (sometimes considered "early indicators"), but no or little demonstrable impact on larger completion rate (Ran and Lin).

As placement reform and developmental reforms have been increasingly implemented across the country, ALP and related structures are becoming the new status quo, and that new status quo is still one of disparate impact and inequitable completion rates. Equity gaps stubbornly refuse to decisively improve despite the implementation of positivist, so-called

“evidence-based” reforms like ALP. We have yet to see any scholarship from reform organizations that explicitly acknowledges the limitations of these efforts, especially as it relates to equity. Such concessions would undermine the neoliberal agenda, which constantly advocates for the next new initiative (such as Guided Pathways) without making room for critical reflection. In contrast, an embodied epistemology works in a feminist mode that acknowledges gaps and limitations, one where “locational agency,” as Stenberg describes it, involves a humble positioning that acknowledges where benefits to marginalized students are unproven.

Impact on Labor

Furthermore, while we attempted to include and compensate adjunct faculty in the redesigned Basic Writing program, the more streamlined program resulted in fewer courses that our division offered. This reduction in classes disproportionately impacted adjunct faculty, whose prioritization for selecting classes comes after full-time faculty members choose their classes. The effect of Basic Writing reform on adjunct faculty underscores the complexity and interdependent nature of the ecology. As we made changes responsive to the material needs of one element of our ecology—our students—the material needs of other members of the ecology became strained. Neoliberal epistemology understands the ecology as consisting of discrete parts, and students occupy an exalted position at the expense of considering other humans who exist in relationship to them. An austerity calculus positions adjunct faculty, especially, as those who need further training to better serve students. An embodied epistemology, on the other hand, refuses this dehumanizing reductionism. Professional development opportunities for all faculty, especially around issues of antiracism and language ideology, are certainly vital. However, when we do not take into account those who dedicate their lives to teaching within unjust labor conditions, we damage the larger ecology and undermine authentic values of equity.

Embodied Epistemology Through Larger Institutional Actions

Embodied epistemologies aligned with the material interests of Basic Writing students should move beyond Basic Writing programs themselves. Higgins, in particular, has dived more deeply into both institutional and statewide equity work within a variety of philosophically related but structurally distinct entities. Collaborative groups made up of faculty and staff who take their role as scholars and activists seriously are meeting to study

the systemic and institutional inequities and acting upon them without recognition or institutional support. For example, her work has included action with a statewide, DEI-focused, independent group of Washington State faculty, staff, administrators, and state board personnel aiming to decolonize our community colleges and decenter whiteness in curriculum, funding, hiring, and so on. Decolonizing the community and technical college systems does not merely align with but strategically implements the more radical tenets of BW scholarship in grassroots action.

On the campus level, the work has included serving as an “equity rep” on hiring committees, a long-running program only recently sanctioned by our college administration. It has also included investing time, creativity, and even money in creating a (re)entry program for formerly incarcerated and system impacted people, nearly all of whom will take transitional studies (formerly Adult Basic Education) or other BW courses. Making space, creating opportunities for students to become more visible on campus, and dedicating resources for BW students, we suggest, is the embodied work of BW scholarship and activism. In these seemingly disparate ways, we study inequities and act on them. In the ecology of our two-year college, these arenas of involvement are vital parts of Basic Writing work and focus the energies of many faculty and staff whose life work is centered on Transitional Studies, Workforce offices, and other entities whose *raison d’être* is centered in advancing the fortunes of BW students—yet we find it challenging to provide enough context and explanation here to ensure these actions’ recognition, publication, and representation within BW scholarship. This is part of what Basic Writing scholarship-activism looks like.

Future Reforms: The Promise and Peril of Guided Pathways

Currently, Guided Pathways is a pervasive set of reforms encompassing those that we’ve mentioned, such as course placement and accelerated education. However, whatever other claims the reformers make regarding student-centered reforms and equitable outcomes, very little research is being produced on the pedagogical and curricular changes that might validate, and harness the strengths of, our students’ lived experiences. In fact, in its scope, Pathways robustly exemplifies neoliberal hegemony. As we continue to track the research on Pathways and related reforms, we find an emphasis on dollars and cents—on making the reforms pencil out in an austerity framework—increasingly evident. Alejandra Marchevsky and Jeanne Theoharis warn in “Restoring the People’s Universities: CUNY, the

CSU, and the Promise of Socially Transformative Education,” their recent article on the New Deal for Higher Education:

Tellingly, graduation initiatives at public comprehensive universities rarely fund faculty-student mentoring, curricular innovation, small seminars, or more opportunities for independent undergraduate research—all of which are proven to increase retention and completion *and* help students excel academically. At base, austerity and the obsession with getting students quickly graduated and employed stems from a racist imagining of low-income students of color as workers rather than thinkers and national leaders.

Most graduation- or completion-centered initiatives for the TYC, too, align with the austerity goals of state legislators and governors. Does the equity-centered rhetoric amount to little, providing cover for a cheapening of education accessible to the majority of students of color, as Marchevsky and Theoharis argue? As critical reformers in two-year colleges, we’ve long suspected that the bottom-line emphasis in much published scholarship on reforms illuminates the austerity-angled ultimate goal. Perhaps a generous reading of this fact is that CCRC and others don’t have funders willing to support other significant outcomes of proposed reforms. We suggest that that generosity ought to cut both ways.

Yet in our conversations with colleagues leading the Pathways reform work on our campus, we find one striking element: a collective shoulder-shrug at Pathways’ theoretical shortcomings and an eagerness to harness the opportunities that these reforms may allow. From their perspective, being assigned to execute Guided Pathways reform work means having state mandates or resource allocations that allows them to begin the on-the-ground-work of scrutinizing the local conditions and responding to them. We believe this illustrates an important point. An embodied epistemology, though not explicitly named, already exists in how so many staff and faculty operate. We imagine this happens at many other institutions as well. Those who work within reforms—from faculty members to advisers—attempt to repurpose them for their own ends—to embody the reforms within the material needs of their departments or areas. Articulating an embodied epistemology, then, gives name to and seeks to embolden the efforts of those already attending to the bodies that matter within our ecologies—those who need care, space, resources, and time in order to thrive. Whether it’s programmatic work on Basic Writing courses, an adviser helping a Basic Writing student navigate a a

new enrollment website, or a staff member pushing back in a meeting against reductive labels on streamlined student pathways, those on the ground already engage in embodied epistemologies, with BW students at the core.

TAKING ACTION, RECOGNIZING LIMITS, AND MAINTAINING HOPE

We believe an embodied epistemology is a framework of hope for more equitable two-year colleges. We believe in materially-minded activism that cautiously works within fraught conditions, and we believe that working locally resists the reductionism of idealized reforms while also negotiating their potential. We seek to keep one eye on systemic causes of suffering in our ecologies, those that neoliberal reformers ignore, while keeping the other on imagining a “better world for Basic Writing” (Bernstein 104) within two-year colleges. For us, this is what the most progressive Basic Writing scholarship has always done and continues the legacy forged at open-access institutions.

Yet we constantly balance the tension between action on the one hand and critical reflection on our limitations on the other. We acknowledge the delusion of overemphasizing our agency and the harms of reifying emancipatory narratives of higher education. These narratives are empirically specious (Beach). We worry about reproducing an academic white-savior position—that by implementing the “right” BW program along with other sensitively adapted reforms, we can not only save our students, but also mint an academic brand (whether that’s “critical reform” or “embodied epistemology”) that maximizes our scholarly worth. As Coleman et al. argue, “If we as teachers of writing normalize (read, accept) the dominant presence of constructed whiteness in the field and discipline among our students and colleagues, how might that consciously or unconsciously affect our teaching in the classroom and the assessment of students?” (367). We worry about giving in to the hegemony of center-left neoliberalism, which in the last 40 years has limited the imagination of what public policy can accomplish and has conceded agency to neoliberal organizations and administrators. An embodied epistemology should not be about individuals from the tenure track handing down changes but rather creating coalitions with students and adjuncts. To understand the complexity of local contexts, we suggest other strategies that we have yet to demonstrate here, such as collective autoethnography (Chang) and writing counter-stories (Martinez) as epistemological approaches that can provide the basis for action, especially for the most marginalized at our institutions. Writing *with*

rather than *about* marginalized students is vital for creating critical reforms that matter. Creating knowledge together, rather than a solo project or one completed, behind closed doors, by so-called “experts,” is one strategy for countering neoliberal approaches to knowledge making. In that regard, this collaborative article is one small gesture.

There are also hopeful signs that the neoliberal orthodoxy is cracking, and this cracking echoes the conditions that led to the open-access university in the 1970s. Could this be another kairotic convergence of interest (Bell)? As the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and American Federation of Teachers (AFT) are banding together to move forward the New Deal for Higher Education, which promotes a progressive re-envisioning of the role of open-access higher education as well as robust funding, the larger national conversation around poverty and mechanisms of social mobility is evolving, too. As moderates accede to the necessity of sharing some of the costs associated with child-rearing and acknowledge poverty amelioration as a national priority; as President Biden’s agenda acknowledges that funding today’s infrastructure extends beyond byways and bridges; as the data on “social mobility” remain mixed and problematic, especially when intersectional racial and ethnic identities are accounted for in the studies; as researchers revolutionize the available data on predictors of poverty, we see signs that neoliberalism’s narrative framing is shifting. Whether its socio-economic structures follow suit is an interesting possibility, one that the open-access movement has yet to fulfill.

As instructors work with students whose collective poverty and traumas are increasingly evident and attempt to alleviate suffering despite systemic limitations, we need to band together as accomplices with those in our communities who are materially suffering. As a rich body of activist scholarship and community activism demonstrate, this work is already well underway. Now is the opportunity to use an embodied epistemology as a framework for action from the writing classroom outwards.

Works Cited

- Adams, Peter, Sarah Gearhart, Robert Miller, and Anne Roberts. “The Accelerated Learning Program: Throwing Open the Gates.” *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2009, pp. 50–69. doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.2009.28.2.04.
- Ayers, David Franklin. “Neoliberal Ideology in Community College Mission Statements: A Critical Discourse Analysis.” *Review of Higher Education*, vol. 28, no. 4, 2005, pp. 527–49. doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2005.0033.

- Baker-Bell, April. *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy*. Routledge, 2020.
- Barnard, Ian. *Upsetting Composition Commonplaces*. Utah State UP, 2014.
- Barnett, Elizabeth A., Elizabeth Kopko, Dan Cullinan, Clive R. Belfield. "Who Should Take College-Level Courses? Impact Findings from an Evaluation of a Multiple Measures Assessment Strategy." *CAPR*, Oct. 2020, ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/multiple-measures-assessment-impact-findings.pdf.
- Beach, Josh M. *Gateway to Opportunity? A History of the Community College in the United States*. Stylus Publishing, 2012.
- Belfield, Clive, and Thomas Brock. "Behind the Enrollment Numbers: How COVID Has Changed Students' Plans for Community College." *Community College Research Center*, 19 Nov. 2020, ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/easyblog/covid-enrollment-community-college-plans.html.
- Bell, Derrick A. "Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma." *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 93, no. 3, 1980, pp. 518-33. doi.org/10.2307/1340546.
- Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Southern Illinois UP, 1987.
- Bernstein, Susan Naomi. "Occupy Basic Writing: Pedagogy in the Wake of Austerity." *Composition in the Age of Austerity*, edited by Nancy Welch and Tony Scott, Utah State UP, 2016, pp. 92-105. doi.org/10.7330/9781607324454.c006.
- Biondi, Martha. *The Black Revolution on Campus*. University of California Press, 2012.
- Brown, Wendy. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. MIT Press, 2015.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge, 2012.
- Cardinal, Alison, Melissa Atienza, and Aliyah Jones. "The Untapped Possibilities of Participatory Video to Study Literacy." *Self Culture Writing: Autoethnography for/as Writing Studies*, edited by Becky Jackson and Jackie Grutsch McKinney. Utah State UP, 2021, pp. 210-22. doi.org/10.7330/9781646421213.c015.
- Cardinal, Alison, and Kelvin Keown. "Story-changing Work for Studio Activists: Finding Points of Convergence." *The Writing Studio Sampler: Stories about Change*, edited by Mark Sutton and Sally Chandler. The WAC Clearinghouse, 2018, pp. 27-42. doi.org/10.37514/per-b.2018.0179.2.02.
- Chang, Heewon. *Collaborative Autoethnography*. Left Coast Press, 2012.

- Clark, Burton R. "The Cooling-Out Function in Higher Education." *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 65, no. 5, 1960, pp. 569-76. doi.org/10.1037/11302-021.
- Coleman, Taiyon, Renee DeLong, Kathleen Sheerin DeVore, Shannon Gibney, and Michael C. Kuhne. "The Risky Business of Engaging Racial Equity in Writing Instruction: A Tragedy in Five Acts." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 43, no. 4, 2016, pp. 347-70. doi.org/10.7330/9781607329305.c013.
- Condon, Frankie, and Vershawn Ashanti Young. *Performing Antiracist Pedagogy in Rhetoric, Writing, and Communication*. The WAC Clearinghouse: UP of Colorado, 2017. doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2016.0933.
- Cooper, Marilyn. "The Ecology of Writing." *College English*, vol. 48, no. 4, 1986, pp. 364-75. doi.org/10.2307/377264.
- Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Second ed., Sage, 2007.
- Dobrin, Sidney I. *Ecology, Writing Theory, and New Media*. Vol. 8, Routledge, 2012. doi.org/10.4324/9780203134696.
- Dougherty, Kevin J. *The Contradictory College, The: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College*. SUNY Press, 1994.
- Elliot, Norbert. "A Theory of Ethics for Writing Assessment." *Journal of Writing Assessment*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2016. journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=98.
- Faigley, Lester. *Fragments of Rationality: Postmodernity and the Subject of Composition*. U of Pittsburgh Press, 1992. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7zwbhf.
- Fink, John, and Davis Jenkins. "Unpacking Program Enrollments and Completions with Equity in Mind." June 2020. *CCRC Analytics*. ccrctc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/unpacking-program-enrollments-completion-equity.pdf.
- Gorski, Paul. "The Myth of the 'Culture of Poverty.'" *Educational Leadership*, vol. 65, no. 7, 2008, pp. 32-36.
- Grego, Rhonda C., and Nancy S. Thompson. *Teaching/Writing in Thirdspaces: The Studio Approach*. Southern Illinois U P, 2007.
- Hamer, Jennifer F., and Clarence Long. "Race, Structural Violence, and the Neoliberal University: The Challenges of Inhabitation." *Critical Sociology*, vol. 41, no. 6, 2015, pp. 897-912. doi.org/10.1177/0896920515594765.
- Harris, Joseph. *A Teaching Subject: Composition since 1966*. New ed., Utah State UP, 2012. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgrgw.
- hooks, bell. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Routledge, 2015.

- Horner, Bruce. *Terms of Work for Composition: A Materialist Critique*. State University of New York Press, 2000.
- Horner, Bruce, and Lu, Min-Zhan. *Representing the "Other": Basic Writers and the Teaching of Basic Writing*. National Council of Teachers of English, 1999.
- Inoue, Asao B. *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future*. Parlor Press, 2015. doi.org/10.37514/per-b.2015.0698.
- Jensen, Darin, and Emily Suh. "Introducing Lived Interventions: Located Agency and Teacher-Scholar-Activism as Responses to Neoliberalism." *Basic Writing e-Journal*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2020, pp. 1-11.
- Kabat, George Jule. "The People's College." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1940, pp. 85-89.
- Klausman, Jeffrey, Leslie Roberts, Joanne Giordano, Brett Griffiths, Patrick Sullivan, Wendy Swyt, Christie Toth, Anthony Warnke, and Amy L. Williams. *TYCA White Paper on Placement Reform*. TYCA Executive Committee. Apr. 2016.
- LaFrance, Michelle. *Institutional Ethnography*. Utah State UP, 2019. doi.org/10.7330/9781607328674.
- Lamos, Steve. *Interests and Opportunities Race, Racism, and University Writing Instruction in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. U of Pittsburgh Press, 2011. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7zw8fk.
- Marchevsky, Alejandra, and Jeanne Theoharis. "Restoring the People's Universities: CUNY, the CSU, and the Promise of Socially Transformative Education." *Academe*. Apr. 2021, www.aaup.org/article/restoring-people%E2%80%99s-universities#.YHnVST9lCUk.
- Martinez, Aja Y. *Counterstory: The Rhetoric and Writing of Critical Race Theory*. National Council of Teachers of English Press, 2020.
- McNenny, Gerri, and Sallyanne H. Fitzgerald, eds. *Mainstreaming Basic Writers: Politics and Pedagogies of Access*. Routledge, 2001. doi.org/10.4324/9781410604798.
- Merriam, Sharan B. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. Fourth ed., Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- National Student Clearinghouse. "Spring 2021 Enrollment (as of February 11)." nscresearchcenter.org/stay-informed.
- Perryman-Clark, Staci, David Kirkland, and Austin Jackson, editors. *Students' Right to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*. Bedford / St Martin's, 2015.

- Poe, Mya, Norbert Elliot, John Aloysius Cogan, Jr., and Tito G. Nurudeen, Jr. "The Legal and the Local: Using Disparate Impact Analysis to Understand the Consequences of Writing Assessment." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 65, no. 4, 2014, pp. 588–611. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/43490874.
- Powell, Katrina M., and Pamela Takayoshi, eds. *Practicing Research in Writing Studies: Reflexive and Ethically Responsible Research*. Hampton Press, 2012.
- Ran, Florence Xiaotao, and Yuxin Lin. "The Effects of Corequisite Remediation: Evidence from a Statewide Reform in Tennessee." *Community College Research Center*. CCRC Working Paper, Nov. 2019. ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/effects-corequisite-remediation-tennessee.pdf.
- Ratcliffe, Krista. "Material Matters: Bodies and Rhetoric." *College English*, vol. 64, no. 5, 2002, pp. 613–23. doi.org/10.2307/3250756.
- Rawson, K. J., and Schell, Eileen E., eds. *Rhetorica in Motion: Feminist Rhetorical Methods and Methodologies*. U of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.
- Reiff, Mary Jo, and Anis Bawarshi, eds. *Ecologies of Writing Programs: Program Profiles in Context*. Parlor Press LLC, 2015.
- Ritter, Kelly. *Before Shaughnessy: Basic Writing at Yale and Harvard, 1920-1960*. Southern Illinois UP, 2009.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones, and Gesa Kirsch. *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*. Southern Illinois UP, 2012.
- Schell, Eileen. "Materializing the Material as a Progressive Model." *Practicing Research in Writing Studies: Reflexive and Ethically Responsible Research*, edited by Katrina M. Powell and Pamela Takayoshi, Hampton Press, 2012, pp. 123–42.
- Shor, Ira. "Our Apartheid: Writing Instruction & Inequality." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1997, pp. 91–104. doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.1997.16.1.08.
- Soliday, Mary. *The Politics of Remediation: Institutional and Student Needs in Higher Education*. U of Pittsburgh Press, 2002.
- Stanley, Jane. *The Rhetoric of Remediation: Negotiating Entitlement and Access to Higher Education*. U of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.
- Stenberg, Shari. "Beyond Marketability: Locating Teaching Agency in the Neoliberal University." *Composition in the Age of Austerity*, edited by Nancy Welch and Tony Scott, Utah State UP, 2016, pp. 191–204.
- Sternglass, Marilyn S. *Time to Know Them: A Longitudinal Study of Writing and Learning at the College Level*. Routledge, 1997.

- Stone, Erica, and Sarah Austin. "Writing as Commodity: How Neoliberalism Renders the Postsecondary Online Writing Classroom Transactional and Ways Faculty Can Regain Agency." *Basic Writing eJournal*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2020.
- Stygall, Gail. "Resisting Privilege: Basic Writing and Foucault's Author Function." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 45, no. 3, 1994, pp. 320-341. doi.org/10.2307/358814.
- Sullivan, Patrick. "The Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar-Activist." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 42, no. 4, 2015, pp. 327-50.
- Tatum, Beverly Daniel. "The Complexity of Identity: 'Who Am I?'" *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice*, edited by Maurianne Adams, Warren Blumenfeld, Carmelita Rosie Castañeda, Heather W. Hackman, Madeline L. Peters, and Ximena Zúñiga. Routledge, 2000, pp. 5-8.
- Toth, Christie. "Directed Self-Placement at 'Democracy's Open Door': Writing Placement and Social Justice in Community Colleges." *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity*, edited by Mya Poe, Asao B. Inoue, and Norbert Elliot. The WAC Clearinghouse and UP of Colorado, 2018, pp. 137-70, doi.org/10.37514/per-b.2018.0155.2.04.
- . "Getting Thorny: Elizabeth McPherson and the Activist Tradition of Two-Year College English." *Basic Writing eJournal*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2020.
- . *Transfer in an Urban Writing Ecology: Reimagining Community College-University Relations in Composition Studies*. Utah State UP, Forthcoming.
- Toth, Christie, Patrick Sullivan, and Carolyn Calhoon-Dillahunt. "A Dubious Method of Improving Educational Outcomes: Accountability and the Two-Year College." *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, vol. 43, no. 4, 2016, pp. 391-410.
- Warnke, Anthony, Kirsten Higgins, and Marcie Sims. "Empowering Autoethnography in Two-Year College Reform." *Self-Culture-Writing: Autoethnography for/as Writing Studies*, edited by Rebecca Jackson and Jackie Grutsch McKinney. Utah State UP, 2021, pp. 115-25.
- Warnke, Anthony, and Kirsten Higgins. "A Critical Time for Reform: Empowering Interventions in a Precarious Landscape." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2018, pp. 361-84. doi.org/10.7330/9781646421213.c007.
- Welch, Nancy, and Tony Scott, eds. *Composition in the Age of Austerity*. Utah State UP, 2016. doi.org/10.7330/9781607324454.
- Young, Vershawn Ashanti, Rusty Barrett, Y'Shanda Young-Rivera, and Kim Brian Lovejoy. *Other People's English: Code-meshing, Code-switching, and African American Literacy*. Teachers College Press, 2014.