

Contents

List of Illustrations vii

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction 3

1. Looking Back (and) to the Future: Reading Inside My Home Program 32
2. Finding Values in the Practicum Syllabus in Interviews
with WPAs and Practicum Instructors 62
3. Getting to Slow Agency via Slowing Conversation
in Curricular Committee Work 97
4. “But Here We Are!” Still Learning How to Teach About Language:
The Practicum, a Revised Curriculum, and the Pandemic 138
5. Between Mission and Action: Restructuring Programmatic
Change Through Teacher Development 183

*Appendix: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol (excerpt): Interviews with WPAs
and Practicum Instructors* 213

Notes 215

References 217

Index 231

About the Author 243

Illustrations

Boxes

- 0.1. Categories of writing program values 11
- 1.1. Categories of readings assigned in Practicum I, 2015–2019 48
- 1.2. Emergent values for teacher development in rhetoric, composition, and writing studies 55
- 2.1. Participants' identified program values (alphabetical order) 73
- 2.2. Emergent values for teacher development in rhetoric, composition, and writing studies 88
- 3.1. Emergent values for teacher development in rhetoric, composition, and writing studies 127

Tables

- 1.1. Practicum I and II Calendar, 2014–2021 37
- 2.1. Interview participants 71
- 2.2. Presence of emergent values in ten practicum syllabi 89
- 3.1. Coding for knowledge domains 112
- 3.2. Experiential evidence offered in the second curricular subcommittee meeting 122

Introduction

For the first ten years I taught college-level composition classes (whether they were senior-level high school composition, AP courses, dual enrollment, at community colleges, or at universities), I did it without thinking much (*almost not at all*) about Composition as a *discipline*. I employed what innately made sense as a process pedagogy—largely the process pedagogy I had experienced as a high school and college student—along the way working with inquiry-based learning and Brian Cambourne’s conditions for learning (a literacy learning framework introduced to me by my master’s program mentor at Central Michigan University, John Dinan). Meaningful and rich, though not necessarily shared by the other teachers I worked with in these settings, these frameworks drove my design of lesson plans, units, and projects. Each year, I worked to be an ever-better teacher of writing and even did a couple of early-career conference presentations on using multi-genre projects in my English language arts (ELA) classes. But even as a licensed English educator, I did not think of myself as a member of any discipline. I was called to my work, engaged in my vocation of teaching high school. When I eventually enrolled in my PhD program in English, rhetoric and composition, it was with an aim to expand my *teaching*—the kind of scholar I would become still had to be developed.

This is important for me to express because it demonstrates one example of how recognition of disciplinary participation and disciplinary values, and what it means to be a compositionist or a scholar in writing studies, might come at various points, or in various ways, to those who *teach* composition courses. For some, this recognition might never come or might be a matter of writing studies being *for them, not me*. For some, it might come with a deep sense of belonging: *This work makes sense to me; it's what I love to do*. For some, this recognition might be a fraught one, as the tensions exercised at the level of disciplinary scholarship reflect personal concerns, experiences, or questions. For me, this participation felt like it came when, as a graduate student, I was invited to join an assessment committee in my program, to bring my experiences and knowledge to the table of programmatic work. In the committee's deep reading of students' reflective writing, long inquiry-based discussions, and efforts to create a feedback loop for instruction, I observed potential (and tacit) program values at play, and I began to have a voice in what our program's good work with students might look like.

Teaching composition courses and participating in the work of writing studies more broadly are about more than writing lesson plans and reading student papers, but what that *more* is is typically discovered and experienced along the way, as teachers participate in conference gatherings; as graduate students take coursework and engage in professional development; and as members of writing programs work to design, assess, and research writing, writing courses, and students' learning. For graduate students who are employed by programs to teach in support of their master's and doctoral work, the initiating vehicle for this teaching journey is often the composition teaching practicum, the course taken prior to or concurrently with graduate teaching assistants' (GTAs') first instructional assignments in a program. And it is in this course where GTAs may not only develop the subject matter knowledge of the discipline but also become initiated into local knowledges that shape the work that they do in their composition classrooms. Catherine Latterell (1996) notes the historical significance of the course, explaining that in the first half of the twentieth century, pedagogy workshops or courses were "often the only graduate-level composition courses offered in many English departments" (7). According to Sidney I. Dobrin (2005), the teaching practicum is, therefore, an enculturation "into the cultural ideologies of composition" (21). It is an integral tool for the composition program to sustain the first-year writing (FYW) course's institutional position (Addison 2005, 257) and a "site of articulation" that prepares instructors for the work they will do in a specific program

(Guerra and Bawarshi 2005, 54). When I was invited to teach one of my program's practicum courses two years after earning my PhD and sixteen years into teaching writing, I felt like I finally had something to say about what being a teacher in rhetoric, writing studies, or composition really means.¹

But teaching composition is bottom-up just as much as it is top-down. This is evident in our research methods and methodologies, in our stories of institutional revolutions attempted and won, and in our emphasis on student voices as central to our scholarship. As writing *teachers*, we are always learning. Shari J. Stenberg's (2005) argument that a framework of *teacher development* (instead of *teacher training*) can have a change-making influence on the shape of the field is an intuitive one, and its implications may be more dramatic than we think. It is a framework that both centers this teacher development and implicates all teachers in a program in ongoing reflection and revision of teaching. Our field is grounded in the reality that its disciplinary knowledge is often made in composition classrooms, by students and teachers. A big part of what it means to teach composition in a writing program is learning not only how to roll with programmatic change but how to make changes in one's own classroom that both improve learning in that classroom context and have effects on students' and teachers' experiences in the larger university, community, and world. Therefore, all teachers in a program, including new teachers, can learn to be agents of change, even if it may feel like they are starting small. Their efforts will be especially effective and sustainable if a program has a recognized and explicit structure for this quality of teacher development, if the program has articulated its values for teacher development, and if its personnel are on board.

Defining and Locating Writing Program Values

I became interested in researching writing program values during a long-term mentoring-centered project I worked on with my colleague Joe Torok, which we describe in "Structuration and Genre: Revising Teaching Observations to Reflect Program Values" (Jankens and Torok 2023). As we explain in that article, in part, our investment in revising our program's teaching observation forms to more clearly reflect program values was the result of many office hours spent struggling with the realization that because not all of our colleagues approached conducting teaching observations with the same values in mind, GTAs regularly faced trouble or had difficult affective responses with the observation process; therefore, in administering these observations, I also regularly

faced trouble and difficult affective responses from both GTAs and the faculty conducting their observations. Our revision of the teaching observation form, then, emphasized two values for teacher development that we felt were central to making sure everyone was on the same page with the teaching observation process: reciprocal interactions and written reflection (values that overlap with each other). An emphasis on reciprocity means that both those faculty conducting observations and instructors being observed articulate to each other (in writing and/or in conversation) what they learn from the observation experience, and all program personnel are engaged in reflective teacher development, not only those instructors new to a program (see also Denise Comer 2011 on this reciprocity). Written reflection, engaged by the observer in this process, is valued as an integral activity to reflective and reciprocal teacher development. We wrote these values—reciprocal interactions and written reflection—into the form to enact them.

But that rhetorical hack—merely writing them into the documents—didn't "solve" teaching observations in the local context. It has not shifted the textual presence of values deeply into shared programmatic talk. There is more emphasizing to do. The colleague who is now in charge of administering teaching observations in my program marvels at how much participants need reminders about a process that has essentially been the same for a decade. Our local search for program values for teacher development, and for how to *write* these values into the program—how to see them articulated—continues; if we explicitly share and articulate a set of values for this work, I think, it won't be a perfect (writing program) world, but it will be a coordinated one.

Recent discussions of disciplinary values (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 2015; Wardle and Downs 2018; Cole and Hassel 2021) examine not only what these values are but why and how we need to use and articulate them. Values are not always easily articulated or shared by all members of an organization, and they are difficult to research (Espedal et al. 2022, 1–2);² in our own field, we continue to work to find language that makes these values explicit. A primary aim of the project presented in this book has been to identify program and potential disciplinary values for teacher development. Through that work, I have found a range of ways of talking about values, both in the scholarship and in my conversations with writing program administrators (WPAs) and practicum instructors; I have also found that values are present in writing program work to varying degrees. Here, I explore a range of ways that values are described and discussed in writing studies scholarship, strategies for bringing values to the surface of writing program work, and a categorization

of values from *tacit* to *articulated* that will support my analysis of talk and texts across the book.

In their chapter in Rita Malenczyk, Susan Miller-Cochran, Elizabeth Wardle, and Kathleen Blake Yancey's (2018) *Composition, Rhetoric, and Disciplinarity*, Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs address the ways scholars have wrestled with the field's disciplinarity. Through their examination of discourse on disciplinarity, they have identified "a number of *implicit* values and ideologies, exposing a number of our field's central values" (121–122; emphasis mine). Wardle and Downs unearth these implicit values that drive conversation and dissensus about disciplinarity: "inclusion, access, difference, interaction, localism, valuing diverse voices, and textual production" (123). They assert that these "shared values" evidence that we "*have already invented our discipline with these values as grounding principles*" (121; emphasis in original). They argue that these are values our field can build on as a means of "embracing disciplinarity" (129), and posit that, while accepting disciplinarity, we should continue to ask and answer questions about the nature of our disciplinarity, including about values (130). In a way, Wardle and Downs reveal how as we work to identify our "Why?"³ as a discipline; even when we disagree about aspects of the nature and function of composition or writing studies, we come to understand our values.

We may also understand our values through the lens and function of adjacent frameworks, as we do through Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle's (2015) discussion of threshold concepts, "concepts critical for continued learning and participation in an area or within a community of practice" (2), a term and concept borrowed from education (Meyer and Land 2006) and employed in research, teaching, and learning across contexts. In her introduction to Adler-Kassner and Wardle's *Naming What We Know*, Kathleen Blake Yancey (2015) describes the variable "use value" of threshold concepts, noting, "In one version [of this use value], threshold concepts function as boundary objects, allowing us to toggle between the beliefs of the discipline and those of individual institutions" (xix). In other words, the articulation of threshold concepts allows the discipline's beliefs or values to come to light and be put into conversation with the values of local writing programs. This note is important because it highlights the shadowiness of the values of the discipline and local writing programs as well as the functional origination of each: Writing programs do not emerge from the nebulous aura of the discipline; they emerge from the working realities of their institutions. This exigence and existence mean that writing program values grow from an in-between space, between institutional context and disciplinary ideal.

Locally, *values* may also be used interchangeably with or in conjunction with discussion of *principles*, as they are in Kelly Ritter's (2018) description of the values of the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) undergraduate rhetoric program:

To expand on what our program values—and supplement the shorthand version in the student learning objectives (SLOs)—here are some guiding principles as I would articulate them:

- An academic writing course should focus on guided instruction in creating, developing, and sustaining *exigent arguments based in the principles of rhetoric*.
- Such a course should also include instruction in *crafting and executing research proposals and projects*, including responsible and meaningful engagement with sources.
- Lower-order concerns should be taught as needed but *always in the context of higher-order concerns*.
- *Writing is a process* that involves peers as well as instructors, one-on-one conferences for student and teacher, and individual and group learning opportunities.
- College writers should be guided toward understanding their work as critical to *present and future participation in the public sphere*. (Ritter 2018, 57; emphases in original)

In Ritter's expression of what the UIUC undergraduate rhetoric program values, we see articulation of values that center on the content and instruction of FYW. These values focus primarily on what students should do and understand in the course. For the purposes of understanding the set of values I seek in this project, I suggest that the relationship to teacher development is found between the lines of these *guiding principles* and *program values*: Teachers should learn how to act as guides, how to be involved in the research and writing process alongside students (57). In our examination of values and our program's teaching observation form, Torok and I report our colleagues similarly expressing the ways teacher development is bound up with student learning outcomes (Jankens and Torok 2023, 82). Reflection, and reflective writing, in our FYW course, is both a tool for developing and transferring writing knowledge and a habit of lifelong learning. So, as Joe and I note, reflection in the teaching observation process is "an important correlate" between graduate-level practicum courses and general education learning outcomes (66), and reflection on undergraduate students' learning is an important part of the reflective practice

of teacher development (82; see also Miller et al. 2005, 90). This overlap of principles and values is further emphasized by participants' expression of values in the interviews I present in chapter 2.

So, the language of learning outcomes is an explicit source of information about program values, and other program documents may also implicitly or explicitly convey these values, like Joe and I demonstrate, and like Jennifer Grouling (2018) emphasizes in "Training Writing Teachers: An Assignment in Mapping Writing Program Values." Grouling explains the development of an assignment based on Bob Broad's "Dynamic Criteria Mapping," in which collaborators identify and discuss what they consider significant elements driving their evaluation of a text. In the "Values Mapping Assignment," teaching assistants (TAs) analyze their mentors' teaching materials and interview these mentors, then create visual representations of their findings. Later, they compare maps and tally representation of values to identify "the larger values of the program as a whole" (11). The assignment allows students to move beyond wholesale borrowing of their mentors' assignments, instead designing their own assignments that "fit with the program's goals" (7). In Grouling's employment of the assignment, values are defined broadly as "not only qualities that teachers wanted from writing, but also qualities they wanted from students (e.g., promptness), and course content they valued (e.g., multimodality)" (6). Coding values inductively—allowing them to "emerge organically from the TAs' interpretations"—highlights for Grouling interesting incongruities between which values are explicit and which are clearly expressed in the materials the TAs analyze (12). Grouling writes, "For example, multimodality is required in our first-year writing courses, yet TAs rarely mapped it as a value in their mentors' teaching materials, which could indicate that it is not being well-used in actual courses" (12). Discoveries like this, then, are not only ways for TAs to learn more about their mentors; they are also fuel for program-wide discussions (12).

GTAs are not the only ones who benefit from this kind of mapping. The "programmatic mapping" that happens in this location and articulation of program values may be, as Laurie A. Pinkert and Kristen R. Moore (2021) point out, analytical and metaphorical, or it may be explicitly multimodal. In either case, as these authors point out, mapping makes quite clear what may otherwise be muddy for program stakeholders (58). Not attending to the ways we articulate and communicate our programs' parts and pieces and motivations may contribute to gatekeeping via errors and miscommunications that keep students or faculty from meeting requirements (59). And, while it is important to have values in print for administrative functions and eyes, only explaining these

through prose (like in syllabi or white papers, for example), might mean the “complex infrastructures” that have determined or support these requirements might be “hidden from frame” (60). Through case studies, Pinkert and Moore show the ways that programmatic mapping contributes to WPAs’ knowledge-making and the development of problem-solving strategies (72–73).

This mapping might help program participants further distinguish between curriculum and pedagogy (and the values tied to these). In *Reformers, Teachers, Writers: Curricular and Pedagogical Inquiries*, Neal Lerner (2019) asserts that while as a field we largely agree on pedagogy, we do not on curriculum, despite the wide uptake of frameworks like the “WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition,” the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, Wardle and Downs’s writing-about-writing curriculum, and Adler-Kassner and Wardle’s identification of threshold concepts. Without emphasis on curriculum, the field’s agency in change making is limited, Lerner argues: “Whatever the causes, our expertise with pedagogy and ‘writing as a process’ emerges as the staple of the field, and that conclusion is considered perfectly tolerable in a climate that allows ‘writing as a process’ to somehow define an entire discipline. But such definitions are only partial, only the shell of a discipline without substantial disciplinary content and certainly without any means to enact meaningful institutional reform” (7). Pointing to texts that claim to compile the knowledge of the discipline, Lerner highlights the ways that pedagogy remains a visible value, but a specific curriculum is not as clearly shared. Lerner argues for the “articulation of curriculum,” describing curriculum as an “assertion of values” (10). In teasing out the distinctions between shared pedagogical values and shared curricular values, Lerner identifies a roadblock for writing studies:

Such assertions [of curriculum] can be easily found in our professional statements, in our commitments to social justice, diversity, and inclusion, and in our research that shows the powerful roles that writing plays to shape/limit/make possible individual and communal agency. We work at odds with our good intentions when our design of curriculum and the curriculum itself do not reflect these values. The result is an uncomfortable relationship between who we are as a field and who we want to be, a gap that can account for the continued failure of our reform efforts. (10)

To Lerner’s point, when our local curricula do not line up with the disciplinary values we have asserted in professional statements and scholarship, we have crafted our own troublesome rifts: We have set our disciplinary goal line but are maybe not all facing in the right directions to carry our local programs to it.

While I read Lerner's book late in my revision of this manuscript, I found in quoted passage a meaningful connection to the tensions between values, curriculum, and action that I experienced while I conducted research on my home program and listened to colleagues from other institutions describe their own program values. In looking at the composition teaching practicum from various perspectives—through the talk and texts of teacher development—I differentiate writing program values from other principles like threshold concepts to show how while program values may be tied to these core principles of writing (and to Lerner's point, especially writing as a process), values illuminate the ways writing program work reflects these principles (or does not).

Through my local search for values for teacher development, evidence that they might be shared across the field, and analysis of how we may best work to enact them, I have identified several categories of values, along with degrees to which they are present and made explicit in the talk and texts of teacher development, which I will briefly explain here (box 0.1).

BOX 0.1. CATEGORIES OF WRITING PROGRAM VALUES

TACIT VALUES: values that are present in program talk, texts, pedagogy, or practice, but not explicitly known

IMPLICIT VALUES: values that are known to individuals but not articulated to others as values

EXPLICIT VALUES: values that individuals directly express in program texts, though they may be idiosyncratically presented

EMERGENT VALUES: values that are shared between some writing program personnel and present in some program texts, to a weight and degree that suggests they might be articulated as program values

ARTICULATED VALUES: known and shared values that circulate in the talk and texts of writing programs

Values often begin in the domain of the tacit and may have a positive or negative valence. That is, a program's tacit values may be evident in challenging or problematic ways as much as in progressive and unifying ways. For example, Andrea Dardello (2019) describes the bullying she experienced as a result of the conflict between her novel coaching approach to teaching writing and the traditional pedagogical values held by influential faculty in her department. While coaching approaches were highly valued at her institution, the department's tacit commitment to the "Western patriarchal view that reinforces objectivity, the teacher as sole knower, and the divorce of emotion from the subject being taught" manifested in administrative actions that ultimately quashed Dardello's project (111–112). These values—beyond being at odds with much of

the progressive rhetoric of the field—expressed to Dardello in conversations with faculty who were “not comfortable with the course design,” ultimately function as challenging to productive programmatic action (111). On the other hand, tacit values might unite program actors in their approaches to work. For example, in our analysis of a group interview with four instructors serving in support roles during the transition to remote learning in 2020, Nicole Guinot Varty and I find the group “worked from a tacit perspective on mentoring during this challenging moment: we should support teachers; we should use expert teachers to support other teachers” (Jankens and Guinot Varty 2025, 148). While we argue that the articulation of explicit values would have led to even more productive teacher development outcomes during this time, the tacit values driving the support team served to unify their aims, if not their results (148).

Implicit values (values that are present in program talk or texts without explicit attention as values) and explicit values (values that are stated but perhaps idiosyncratically), are most evident, I think, at the individual level. For example, in a syllabus for a graduate course on composition theory I taught in 2020, I put only texts by women composition scholars on our reading list, to center the work of women and marginalized scholars. I did not articulate this value to my graduate students, however, as I took a more subversive approach to those curricular choices (choices that today I explicitly articulate to students). Explicit values, on the other hand, are those we can point to in course artifacts. In my present first-year writing syllabus, I state the value of peer and teacher feedback to our classroom assessment ecology (and this language has been included in our program’s common syllabus for FYW as an example, so it likely appears in many other teachers’ syllabi as well). After describing our “complete/incomplete” grading system, I explain in this passage in the syllabus that

if an assignment is marked as “incomplete,” I will provide feedback in Canvas explaining what you need to do to complete the assignment, and you may revise and resubmit the assignment based on the timeline I provide. As Asao B. Inoue (2021) writes in *Above the Well*, “Both writer (student) and readers (teacher and peers) are vital in assessing whatever they produce because we must dialogue, have a give and take . . . We can only make sense of the writer’s work when we understand how it is read by others and ourselves in the classroom context” (41). Peer and teacher feedback, and your own reflection and revision, are significant to your work in this class.

This language I developed, and that draws on Inoue’s description, makes explicit to my students and colleagues that feedback, talking with each other

about our writing, reflection, and revision are the central activities I value as the teacher of the class, and they bear out in the activities of the course. In my discussions with WPAs and practicum instructors in chapter 2, these program personnel identify implicit and explicit values in their own syllabi and programs: Sometimes the language of a syllabus presents a value explicitly; sometimes the inclusion of particular activities in a course implies a value.

Emergent values, like those I identify in chapter 1, are present across program talk and/or texts, though they may not have been identified, yet, as shared program values. Michelle LaFrance's (2019) description of the "ruling relations" that organize the ways that work happens in workplaces is helpful for explaining emergent values:

Ruling relations make themselves visible when we see over time and space how the work of one person (or a small group of people) bears similarities to the work of others in other programs, classrooms, or locations. When we see writing teachers or writing programs, for instance, share vocabulary, philosophies of writing, and similar sorts of assignments or when those we interview independently tell the same stories, reflect on the same moments, discuss the same issues, or offer a shared sense of purpose, ruling relations are coming into visibility. (32)

When we look intently for these workplace practices, we may be able to identify locations where shared approaches emerge. In this project, I seek out these similarities as they relate to writing program values broadly and values for teacher development, specifically. These values function as ruling relations whether they are explicitly known by writing program participants or not, and they do so in tension with other contextual realities, group norms, positionalities, and pressures.

Finally, articulated values in the writing program context are those values (for teacher development, for writing instruction, for writing program administration, etc.) that are actualized in the work of the program—the ideas and motivations that can be identified in the concrete actions, documents, and policies of the program and that are present in the talk of program actors. Articulated values are stated, shared, and acted upon. On the Antiracist Language and Literacy Practices Research Team I have been a part of since 2020, to articulate our values we created a living "values and practices" document that we continue to revisit and revise as a grounding touchstone for our research team's work. In the document, we outline our dedication to equity, inclusivity, and change, and tie each of these to action. For example, about equity, we write,

First and foremost, our research agenda is driven by the following goals related to **equity**: (1) ensuring all students' language and literacy practices are acknowledged, valued, and welcomed in university classrooms, and (2) identifying and interrogating white supremacist literacy and language systems inherent to institutions of higher learning and current configurations of "academic English" as the language of higher learning. With these goals in mind, we work to identify the language attitudes and practices of WSU students and faculty, understand and assess the impact of antiracist language and literacy practices, and foster more equitable teaching and assessment practices across the disciplines. For our collaborative work as a team, *equity* means sharing both the responsibility and merit of research and publication. Equity also means intentional collegiality, not only between members of the team, but between research team members and the community participants with whom we engage. (Antiracist Language and Literacy Practices Research Team 2022)

In these lines, we articulate our commitment to equity; this articulation is met with research design and collaborative writing practices that put this value into action. As a living document, the "values and practices" statement supports the engagement of new team members and shapes the work we take on each academic year.

The work of writing programs is expansive, and it can be powerful to know how to explain why we do the variety of work we do in classrooms, in conference rooms, in writing centers, in practica, and in committees. I prepare an argument in this book that making these values explicit and articulating them in program talk are powerful steps for program personnel (especially GTAs and the faculty engaged in their professionalization) and for the discipline at large, as we proceed toward more determination of what holds us together and how we will accomplish our disciplinary ideals. I demonstrate the need for this articulation through studies tied to a core site of teacher development: the composition teaching practicum. Focusing on the practicum allows me to dig deeply into one site where values, curriculum, and pedagogy come together.

Why Focus on Teacher Development?

In *Professing and Pedagogy: Learning the Teaching of English*, Stenberg (2005) argues for the field to take on a notion of teacher development over and above one of "teacher training." Teacher development, Stenberg argues, frames the learning of teaching as a "lifelong process" (133). When our first contact with new teachers in writing programs positions their initial experiences as part

of this process, we also carry out the idea that all teachers are “knowers” (135). For Stenberg, this framing of teachers as knowers has the power to reshape what it means for our field to enact a disciplinarity—the field is built from our pedagogical knowledge-making. Teaching is not private, Stenberg asserts, but rather should be made “public for reflection and revision” (135). It is a collaborative act, and one that should happen across disciplinary lines (135). We need to make this teacher development framework clear to new teachers in our programs upon first contact, including making it known that there is a triad at work, a “dialogue between new teacher, experienced teacher, and the field, with all three open to revision” (134). As I will describe in this introduction, the project I lay out in this book takes teacher development as its focus for understanding program values; it also, however, takes up a methodological framework that, in part, demonstrates teacher development in action, particularly through Stenberg’s emphasis on teaching being made “public for reflection and revision,” as I write through my own learning as a teacher-scholar.

In this brief discussion of literature on teacher development and the practicum, I assert why this project necessarily explores teacher development through discussions about values. As Kristine Hansen (2018), describing the role of a sole supervisor of new composition instructors, writes, “One person (sometimes two or more) with disciplinary expertise and professional status is expected to constantly make writing teachers out of dozens of people who have had little or no opportunity to study the discipline of Writing and Rhetoric prior to teaching” (136). This bald-faced way of putting the job emphasizes the kind of magic that is expected to happen in a pre-semester orientation or semester-long practicum course. The reality of this expectation is likely what, in a more positive way, lends itself to the kinds of teaching and learning strategies developed by practicum instructors, and the theoretical orientations that will most effectively lead to the magic outcome of semi-professionalized writing instructors emerging from the practicum. Orientations of teacher development over teacher training (Stenberg 2005) and classroom projects like peer-to-peer teaching, reflective writing, and observing mentor teachers (as described in scholarship on the practicum and as employed by the practicum instructors I interview in chapter 2) remove the top-down, filling-empty-vessels imperative of this structure by naming the work as something else. It is not banking (ala Freire); it is a collaborative cultivation, as each teacher (practicum instructor included) brings their experiences in the classroom and their conceptions of literacy (Brewer 2020a) to bear on the lessons of the practicum course itself.

Scholarship on the practicum has well-addressed the challenge of how to bring GTAs to composition theory—or composition theory to GTAs—through the course. As noted at the top of this introduction, the practicum often serves more as the point of initiation for GTAs into the discipline as much as it prepares them to work as teachers in the local site. To avoid inculcation, and instead take up the collaborative knowledge-making central to our field, practicum instructors must design ways for GTAs to interact with theoretical concepts and disciplinary content. Often, studies of GTAs' experiences lead to arguments for specific content in the teaching practicum (e.g., Ebest 2002, 2005; Winslow 2005). For example, Aimee Mapes and Susan Miller-Cochran (2019) pose threshold concepts of writing as central to the course, using the examples from a pre-semester orientation and activities in the practicum course at University of Arizona to show the ways that this approach addresses “two primary challenges GTAs face when assigned to teach writing classes for the first time: lack of disciplinary knowledge in writing studies and lack of a theoretical construct for teaching writing” (219). The shared vocabulary provided by the threshold concepts allows GTAs and mentors to construct pedagogical content knowledge for teaching in the local context (222). In this book, I look both in and around the practicum course to understand the ways that program (and even disciplinary) values, specifically, might better (or also) function as core to this training, to help GTAs understand why they are working as they do. That is, if we can agree on what these values are.

To be clear, I am not advocating for skipping past disciplinary knowledge or threshold concepts of writing in our teacher development and to some more wiggly conception of values. The development of disciplinary knowledge happens for the individual teacher over time, as they engage with scholarship and work through their own classroom practice (often in reverse). While, as I noted in my opening remarks, I was a conscientious and caring writing teacher in my vocation, I experienced an a-disciplinary apprenticeship to the work, dancing on the outskirts of writing studies even as I taught courses, completed my first graduate degree, and applied for doctoral programs so that I could more confidently, appropriately, and sustainably teach college writing as a career. However, like Hansen (2018) warns, “Because we haven’t protected our profession’s boundaries for insisting on qualified teachers with adequate disciplinary knowledge, the boundaries we should have set are often now out of our control” (155). Hansen is not only concerned for the workaday lives of WPAs who oversee hiring and training teachers for their writing programs but also and especially for the students who work through our courses. To best serve

them, to best prepare them for their future classes and for civic engagement, Hansen says, we need “a truly professional class of teachers whose judgment is grounded in deep, broad disciplinary knowledge before they undertake this important work” (155).

And to be an effective instructor within a specific site, a “truly professional class of teachers” needs to understand the specific pedagogies and necessary processes structuring teaching in that program; beyond this, they need to know why these pedagogies and processes function as they do in that program. Ideally, they *do* function, and ideally, they function because program personnel share core values that drive this coordinated work. While we may expect to see program values manifest in discussions of pedagogy or in pedagogical materials themselves, analysis of local sites might show otherwise. Indeed, In chapter 3, I demonstrate how when nodes of material relations like intentional access of institutional history and curiosity about teachers’ experiences are not explored, curricular recommendations begin to take a shape curiously different from previous iterations of the practicum course.

The work of teacher development in writing programs serves as a rich site for studying the evidence and articulation of values because it is both a site where GTAs are introduced to the work of the field, through their teaching assignments and a site where multiple, complex writing program activities converge to demonstrate to graduate students what is valued *in practice*. Thus, the practicum, as the core location of this teacher development, can be a kind of proving ground for which local or disciplinary writing studies values “stick.” More pointedly, Dobrin (2005) calls the practicum a “site of control” for composition studies (23), a means by which programs “maintain control over what can and should be taught not just in FYC classes but also in any other classes students then teach” (25). However, as Dobrin notes, and Amy Cicchino (2020) reiterates, the teaching practicum has not widely been a site of theorization for the field at large, though composition and writing studies scholars have often published on their work in local programs. Much of this scholarship, even that which theorizes more broadly, focuses on the experience of graduate students in the practicum course (e.g., Ebest 2002; Restaino 2012; Grouling 2015), or on the impact of the practicum on GTAs’ subsequent teaching (e.g., Winslow 2005; Reid et al. 2012), or offers examples of and rationale for the practicum syllabus (e.g., Guerra and Bawarshi 2005; Odom et al. 2005). While these are stories that are also included in this book, I work, in addition, to consider the picture these narratives weave together.

Looking at Teacher Development Through a Responsive IE Framework

I started teaching our program's second practicum course, which I will call Practicum II in this book, in the winter of 2016, my fifth year working at Wayne State, with the specific charge to help GTAs begin to explore online teaching and our various intermediate composition (IC) courses. This assignment changed each year in response to program needs and has been significantly different each of the four times I have taught it. I began teaching our first pedagogical practicum course, which I will refer to as Practicum I, in 2019 and taught it again in fall 2021, the semester I conducted the interviews I present in chapter 2, and in fall 2023, when I had completed the first draft of the book for review. Writing program administration was something I had a peripheral relationship with in my role administering our program's teaching observations for five years (see Jankens and Torok 2023), in my roles on several assessment and curricular committees and task forces, and in what seemed to be an unofficial role as a kind of contemporary program historian, simply because I could hold everyone's projects and experiences and working lives in the files of my brain. It seemed understood that I would likely take on the role of WPA post-tenure, but I was not tasked with that role before reaching the tenure milestone. I was grateful for my chair's support and protection in my pre-tenure role, for the chance to focus on my research, and, especially, for the chance to learn about the role of WPA, and, more specifically, about how to reconcile program values and teacher development through my research. In effect, I got to research the role and landscape before inhabiting it. I got to think through both what I hoped to do and what obstacles and challenges might face me in that work.

The methodology necessary for this project came to light as I worked through the material of each of the studies of this book, from 2020 to 2022, as we grappled with teaching and administering writing instruction during the COVID-19 pandemic and its related protocols and struggles. My experiences with practicum instruction and some administration of teacher development in my home program shaped my research questions and analysis. Participation in any institutional site is context driven and laden with subjectivity; LaFrance (2019) explains, "As such, an individual's social alliances, experiences, and sensibilities play a defining role in how that individual negotiates everyday institutional settings and sites of writing (such as classrooms, programs, or departments)" (37). This influence of context on me, as program actor and researcher, will be highly evident in the chapters in this book; it is also brightly presented in the experiences of participants in my studies: practicum

instructors, committee members, and practicum students. I have worked to be as attentive as possible to these contextual influences articulated by participants or emergent in my analysis of their contributions. This is my effort to attend to standpoint, the dynamic social context that shapes discourse and action in my studies and from which I view and interpret this discourse and action (LaFrance 2019, 36–37). In participating in and examining the sites I consider in this project, my perspective—indeed a sometimes (re)visionary one—is made explicit and sometimes problematizes the work. This is part of the “inward journey” described by feminist scholars Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa E. Kirsch (2012, 85), wherein the researcher attends to “how they process, imagine, and work with materials.” As I read and reread the artifacts from a historical program archive, the work of a committee, transcripts from class sessions and interviews, a collection of student work, and practicum syllabi, they become a part of my own story as a researcher (85).

My conversations with practicum instructors and analysis of practicum syllabi (chapter 2) required me to look up from my position as a peer—an instructor in the same course at another university—but also to acknowledge that I was not yet in the WPA position presently or recently held by my participants. I had much to learn from our conversations and found, as the interviews began, an irrefutable enthusiasm for talking with other people who had worked through the decisions I had made in organizing and teaching the practicum. It is an energy that comes through in the ways we affirm and encourage each other in the Zoom calls that allowed us to spend time together during the pandemic. In conducting teacher research on my own practicum course (chapter 4), I embodied, as an instructor, many of the same urgencies and struggles as GTAs in my class, teaching a new curriculum and teaching online during the pandemic. But I had to balance these urgencies and struggles with the necessities of acting from my position of teacherly authority, and then as a classroom researcher, to provide an honest, if subjective, picture of what we worked through in the course. This required me to take careful notes, record sessions, read, reread, and member-check the ways I constructed the story of that class so that my standpoint of researcher and graduate advisor did not cloud the teacherly parts of me that faced similar challenges to GTAs that term. In my study of our local program history and curricular revision (chapters 1 and 3), identifying this standpoint was the most difficult. I wrestled with emotional reactions to my initial readings of a committee’s work revising the practicum syllabus: as a longtime practicum instructor, and as someone not serving on that committee, I had no contemporary voice to insert into the site of inquiry.

While the committee spent time reviewing documents that I and other former practicum instructors had created, I was in part a specter of semesters gone by, in part the assistant professor who set up an audio recorder at the beginning of meetings instead of attending because (it was thought) her physical presence might have kept committee members from sharing their real thoughts about the course. This wrestling is what led me to understand my guiding methodology, one that I call *responsive institutional ethnography*, or *responsive IE*.

As I define it, the responsive IE framework I employ is inquiry based, focused on a local problem, and produces action. It is responsive in that it attends to listening, reflection, and revision (as presented in strategic contemplation and the work of teacher development), and it is IE because it takes up the coordination between texts, processes, people, and more ephemeral concepts (like values and change) in the writing program workplace, a workplace that functions within the pressures and politics of the larger university. I might have taken up a solely IE project (the initial impetus for the work, an examination of committee discussions and recommendations, might have allowed that) but the pull of my role as a practicum instructor and program actor made the work inherently different for me, as I was invested in not only the results of the work for my scholarship but also the program-based work I would need to do with the results. As I describe in chapters 1 and 3, the very concrete local problem that engaged my attention at the start of this project was that a curricular subcommittee was tasked with making recommendations for a common syllabus for our teaching practicum, and, as a longtime instructor of the course not on the committee, I was curious with what knowledge and purpose they would do that work, what values for teacher development they would center in their recommendations. The action that emerged from this initial curiosity was that I wanted to make sure that teacher development in my home program (indeed, in any writing program) is structured via a shared set of values for this work, because, as described earlier, the practicum initiates teachers into working for a specific program and even into the discipline. The broadest question I asked was, Where are program values in this writing program work? To get at that, I asked more focused questions that began with these: What do I see when I work to read my writing program's artifacts for program values? What do I hear when I talk with other practicum instructors about values and values-driven work? What happens when I try to structure (or sometimes shoehorn) values-driven work into my practicum course?

LaFrance's (2019) description of three phases of her work as an institutional ethnographer certainly provided an inroad into the project for me. The first

includes the identification of a problematic (52), a problem, its context, and the people and conversations working through and around and because of it (39). LaFrance clarifies: “A ‘problematic’ is not necessarily a ‘problem,’ such as the issue of low pay per course for contingent faculty. A problematic may begin with such a problem, but it then recognizes and accounts for the situated, complex, and interconnected relations among people, their experiences, and their practices related to that problem” (39). The “problem” under discussion across this book is the need to provide new graduate instructors with immediate and ongoing preparation for teaching FYW. The problematic I explore includes the following: the changing nature of the practicum courses in my home program; the diversity of approaches to and values for constructing teaching practica across the field; the ways that various instructors have approached the curriculum of the course; the work of administration to compose white papers on GTA training and gather GTA perspectives on the practicum via informal focus group sessions; and the committee structure of the program, which brings together non-tenure track (NTT) faculty and graduate students to design recommendations for a common syllabus.

The second phase of IE includes gathering data, including official documents and personal accounts (LaFrance 2019, 53). I work specifically in my local site to preserve institutional memory through the collection and analysis of documents related to teacher development and the stories of participants in our local teacher development. I began gathering materials for this project in January 2020 and conducted my last interview in November 2021. This collection included historical program documents related to our teaching practicum courses (syllabi, white papers, and focus group notes), transcripts of committee meetings and committee documents, and transcripts of class discussions in a teaching practicum course. Most of this qualitative research and artifact gathering was done online and remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic, though, to me, one gift of the study presented in chapter 3 is that I was able to capture face-to-face recordings of committee discussions about the practicum syllabus in the weeks before our campus shifted to remote learning. As I composed each chapter, I worked to capture the processes and experiences that stem from program decisions or lead to concrete programmatic outcomes.

The third aspect of IE relevant to this project is “an ongoing and recursive development of an analytic framework” (LaFrance 2019, 54). In my project, this ongoing and recursive development happened as I reflected on and read across the data for all three studies. Across this project, I look at how individual players draw on and work through their experiences in talking about the work

of teaching writing and designing teacher development in writing programs, to help these identities, expertise, and labor come to light. The positions and relative power of these individuals are worn on their sleeves; they are aware of these and bring them into conversations. The immediate contexts in which these articulations happen (in Zoom-based interviews, in committee meetings, and in an online practicum course) and the broader contexts in which these discussions are situated (collaborating, teaching, and administering in writing programs, during the time of the pandemic and significant cultural action related to race and equity in the United States) impact the content and circulation of ideas. While I attend to my local site, both as longtime participant and researcher, I also investigate the ways other WPAs and practicum instructors see (or do not see) program values manifest in their sites of teacher development. Therefore, a strictly framed institutional ethnographic approach would not work; I needed to amend it to be able to see and listen both inside and outside of my home program, which a responsive IE approach would allow me to do.

As noted, this project also works to enact Stenberg's (2005) framework of teacher development in that it, in part, publicly presents reflections on teaching, with revision as a primary aim of this reflection—an important part of what makes this work responsive. Stenberg's description of teacherly reflection as core to teacher development was one I tacitly understood and employed during the work of composing this book. It was in composing the first draft of the final chapter that I recognized that my writing work, and its production of revised teaching work, was a kind of demonstration of the reflection and revision that Stenberg asserts is central not only to a framework of teacher development but also to what makes teaching into knowledge making in our discipline. Throughout the project, I reflect on my role as a practicum instructor, the decisions I made in constructing practicum syllabi and in classroom conversations, and the revisions I would make to classroom and curriculum talk because of these reflections. I describe this work as demonstrative of a teacher development framework not because the project takes teacher development as a central topic but because the research work of the project has an impact on me, as a practicum instructor—it changes me, as a teacher. These personal teacherly changes and the teaching problems, decisions, and revisions of participants in my studies are made public in these pages (Stenberg 2005, 135).

Finally, I employ strategic contemplation (Royster and Kirsch 2012) to engage reflection not only at the individual level (mine, as a researcher and practicum instructor) or program level (especially my home program, as

I unearth implicit values for teacher development) but also to engage the values-focused concerns of WPAs and practicum instructors across the field. In strategic contemplation, the researcher spends time listening to the subjects (present and past) with whom they engage, reflecting on what they hear from these voices, in texts, and how they engage with these voices and text in a particular time and place. Often employed with archival research, strategic contemplation allows the researcher to find the resonances between past and present, between understanding oneself and learning the text. Royster and Kirsch describe the researcher being “willing to stop and think multidirectionally, from the outside in and the inside out, not just about the subject of the study but about themselves as the agents in the process” (86). I do use strategic contemplation in this way, as I examine recent historical program documents associated with my program’s practicum courses, with the relative distance and space provided by a handful of years and paradigmatic changes provided by the pandemic. But I also employ strategic contemplation in this project as a necessary method for slowing down the responsive nature of WPA research and teacher development, of being both program actor and researcher at once. Royster and Kirsch emphasize this iterative and chrono-circular deliberation: “Our view is that contemplative practices need to be seriously engaged and strategically incorporated over the course of the work in order for researchers to function optimally as critical and creative thinkers” (86). In a simple way, the natural elements of time and writing process were conducive to this methodology, as I worked inductively from study artifacts to craft the analytical frameworks and processes driving each chapter and then wrote the implications and conclusions of those chapters. Less simple was the work of intentional reflection, as I talked about the project, shared drafts with participants, and stepped back from the whole to consider the complex insights stretching across each study. Recursively working between listening, analysis, and reflection, I methodically practiced this strategic contemplation as I read program artifacts and attended to the talk of participants in my studies; as Cheryl Glenn (2018) clarifies, “Strategic contemplations are not mystical; they are authentic encounters of creatively working together toward that greater good” (120).

As an insider analyzing discussions and documents from my own writing program, as I do in chapter 3, stepping back and acknowledging my feelings became crucial to being able to work through the process. As I describe in that chapter, when institutional knowledge seemed to be disregarded or simply unknown, when instructors’ experiences were minimally acknowledged but not engaged, or when I didn’t agree with the outcome of the conversations I

was reviewing, I felt frustrated and dismayed, especially since I was researching the curriculum revision process in real time, and because my teaching work would be directly impacted by the decisions of the committee I was studying. But, a responsive stance was integral here, because, whether I was researching the committee's work or not, whether this was any other daily problem-solving task that members of my writing program might engage in together, I was going to have feelings about it—maybe relief, irritation, ambivalence, or who knows, even joy—so being able to acknowledge those feelings, consider alternative viewpoints, inquire into absent but important voices, and work through the process would all be important. That is to say that practicing a responsible responsiveness—both in research and in the daily work of writing program administration—is necessary. Somewhere between the “slow agency” recommended by Laura Micciche (2011) for WPAs' reflective practice and action and the “urgent agency” described by Stephen Monroe (2021), when WPAs and program personnel must make quick-thinking and -acting decisions based on always-changing circumstances and even emergencies, responsive IE would function as both a research and administrative orientation. As a research method, responsive IE allows me to look at and listen to the artifacts from my studies with a creative and critical distance (Royster and Kirsch 2012, 86). As a work orientation, this responsive IE can prepare me for action.

Contributions

In the introduction to their recent collection *Transformations: Change Work Across Writing Programs, Pedagogies, and Practices*, Kirsti Cole and Holly Hassel (2021) gesture to the articulation of program values, writing, “We must articulate what that [change] work is and how we can do that work just as well as we articulate our changing pedagogies” (4). While they do not use the term *values* here, Cole and Hassel call for this articulation of work in a discussion of attention to labor and to “offer models for faculty who hope to build new programs or revise existing ones” (4). This “hope” is, I assert, a values-driven one. In closing their introduction, Cole and Hassel more directly call for an articulation of values, especially in light of the changes brought to writing programs and institutions of higher learning because of the COVID-19 pandemic, saying, “It will be more important than ever that we articulate these values to ourselves, our colleagues, and our discipline as we face unprecedented and swift calls for change” (15). The chapters of their edited collection convey perspectives inclusive of the array of writing program personnel working in this vein and the

myriad projects they attend to, including advocacy for underserved members of the university and community, instructor labor conditions, and the often hidden or unnoticed work of writing program personnel. These are stories and studies that indeed serve as models of change work in action.

While I emphasize teacher development and values-based change as the center of writing program work in this book, this is not a project proclaiming the centrality of teaching to the work of writing studies. We teach writing, we teach graduate students how to teach writing, and we are teachers of writing at the same time that we are scholars of what writing is and does. Rather, this project presents the ways that the values of this complex and energized field manifest in the primary location where teacher development is exercised—the composition teaching practicum—and the talk and texts that support and direct that course. The overarching argument of the book is that we must build programmatic values into the administrative talk, texts, and processes that structure teacher development and then assess our work with these values by listening to the experiences of teachers. That articulation of values, activated through the design of teacher development and assessed through sites of teacher development, bolsters writing programs as they work to instigate and sustain change, especially social-justice-oriented change. This, then, brings the two—teacher development and programmatic change—inextricably together.

In *The Talk and Texts of Teacher Development: Values, the Practicum, and Programmatic Change in Writing Studies*, I foreground these two ambitions (teacher development and programmatic change) as both core to writing program work and as viably bound up with each other. The question of writing program and writing studies values served as the impetus for the studies presented in the book: I wanted to understand what program values were driving decisions about our program's teaching practicum, how other practicum instructors and WPAs saw their program values present in practicum syllabi and the wider work of the course, and what happened when I integrated texts tied to implicit program values into our practicum. These inquiries resulted in practical applications for making values explicit in the composition teaching practicum and other teacher development settings. This approach empowers all teachers in a writing program to effect lasting change within the classroom, program, university, and wider community.

This project adds to recently published scholarship exploring the focus of the practicum course (Brewer, *Conceptions of Literacy*, 2020), the positionality and experience of GTAs in writing programs (Macauley et al., *Standing at the Threshold*, 2021), and the perennial work of the field to identify its core values

and disciplinary identity (Malenczyk et al., *Composition, Rhetoric, and Disciplinary*, 2018). The project aims to understand the work of teacher development from the perspective of programmatic structures and their ties to disciplinary energies. As such, the focus of individual chapters necessarily moves between examining teacher development in a local context (the composition program at an urban R1 university) and examining values in teacher development from a more expansive qualitative viewpoint (through interviews with WPAs and examination of teaching practicum syllabi from across writing programs and through consideration of recent scholarly discussions of values-based action in writing studies).

This discussion will be especially valuable to instructors new to teaching the practicum and instructors weary from teaching the practicum. I can certainly relate to both audiences. As a practicum instructor, I have become used to an almost annual exercise in wholesale revision, our needs for the course changing every year. GTA feedback on our program's Practicum I has kept that course shifting in a way that, as my colleague Nicole Guinot Varty described it in a pandemic-era Zoom call, has had us working like softball players, always in ready position, used to swings and misses. Over the last decade of leading teacher development in our program, it would have been easy many times for us to fall into fatigue and, frankly, sorrow about teaching the course—something like what Lu Ellen Huntley (2005) describes in "Finding Myself Lost in the Composition Practicum Course," and concluding, or hoping, "I probably will not teach the practicum course again" (299). However, going up to bat every semester has made me somewhat of an experiential expert in ready, responsive teacher development—Nicole and I describe some of this work in our chapter in *WPAing in a Pandemic and Beyond: Revision, Innovation, and Advocacy* (Jankens and Guinot Varty 2025). Like the WPAs and practicum instructors I interview in chapter 2, I hold a persistent assurance about the work of the practicum and the possibilities the course holds as a site for change.

Outline of the Book

I recognize that this project treads a line between the local and empirical. In attending to the local, I seize responsivity in moments where teacher development is happening outside of traditional semester and classroom boundaries: I engage a study of committee work and artifacts in a semester that ends up abbreviated due to the stay-at-home order in the spring of 2020; I provide an account of working to implement readings on social justice, antiracist

teaching, and linguistic justice in an online practicum class during the third semester of the pandemic. These are moments where our best-laid plans for teacher development shift to *making things work*, and I strive to listen to what happens in and around that work to discover where values for teacher development manifest in action. In my turn to the field, then, in discussions with WPAs and classroom instructors from other institutions, I analyze texts and talk in depth, rather than aiming for breadth—this deep listening is crucial. This responsive examination of the people, texts, ideas, process, and values that coordinate the work of the composition teaching practicum offers a practice that is intuitive, practical, and productive.

The chapters of this book first focus on identifying emergent shared values for teacher development, both within my home program and across programs. Then, I examine whether and how these values manifest in curricular planning, and I look pointedly at integrating values-based action in my own practicum course. I begin my work in chapter 1 by reading inside my local writing program via an examination of a small archive of historical program documents related to the composition teaching practicum. It is a study incited by the concurrent work of a curricular subcommittee who would be making recommendations for a common syllabus for the practicum. The local program history that I compose, which prepares me to engage with curriculum committee artifacts later in chapter 3, emphasizes multiple perspectives on the practicum course between 2014 and 2019. Through the presentation of several themes that emphasize these varied perspectives and programmatic tensions, I work toward the identification of emergent program values for teacher development, values that are evident across historical artifacts but not always explicit in program talk and texts. Therefore, this history highlights the institutional (program) knowledge and values-focused talk available for my program's curriculum committee's uptake in their work making recommendations for a common syllabus for the teaching practicum.

While I was learning a lot about the practicum in my own program as I explored this recent program history, I also wanted to understand practicum courses in other writing program contexts. The work of chapter 2 answers two central questions: *How are teacher development values articulated from the standpoint of the WPA?* and *Do these values match with those represented in practicum syllabi?* My intention in investigating these expressions of values is twofold: to work toward an understanding of the ways that values manifest in local program work—specifically the work of the practicum—and to provide conversational examples to writing programs working to reconcile any gaps between what they

say they value and what happens in practice. In this chapter, I present findings from interviews with four WPAs and practicum instructors from writing programs at universities with graduate programs in writing studies. Recounting themes from my conversations with participants, I present examples of congruence or disjunction between program values and values at work in the practicum. I also demonstrate the practicum as a site wherein program change often originates. Through looking at practicum syllabi from a larger set of programs, I propose that perhaps the emergent values for teacher development that I can see historically at work in my home program do indeed hold water in the field, providing a clarity of vision for this core work of our discipline.

In chapter 3, I return to examining teacher development in my home program as I read transcripts from curricular subcommittee meetings about making recommendations for the common syllabus of our program's teaching practicum course. I consider the implications of the committee's resulting work, both on the practicum itself and on future committee work. Using a triad of knowledges to organize my reading of the committee transcripts, I consider the ways that intuition, institutional knowledge, and experiential knowledge manifest in committee talk. I especially consider the ways that committee talk might be deepened and slowed down to better consider institutional and experiential knowledge, necessities for tuning in to the ways that shared program values might influence or shape curricular recommendations. Further, in my analysis, I show how three of the emergent values for teacher development I identified in chapter 1 are evident in the committee's work, but I raise questions about the ways that disciplinary frameworks and the local imperative of writing instruction factor into the committee's recommendations. This chapter provides one narrative of the development of a practicum curriculum, drawing its impetus from narratives like Juan C. Guerra and Anis Bawarshi's (2005) description of their work revising an orientation and practicum sequence for new GTAs. It contributes to scholarship outlining the important service work of NTT faculty and graduate students in composition programs, as well as responds to Latterell's (1996) identification of a disciplinary challenge to make writing pedagogy "part of the regular conversations of many people in a department" (22). Placing my description as a response to Micciche's (2011) "slow agency" and Stephen Monroe's (2021) "urgent agency," I demonstrate how the study—as part of the larger project of the book—explores the administration of teacher development from both within and standing under (Ratcliffe 2005, 28) the circulating discourses of program actors, program texts, and scholarship.

Taking my initial findings (and frustrations) to heart, I worked in my own practicum course to integrate what I understood as implicit program values and inquired about GTAs' experiences in the course as a result. In chapter 4, I tell the story of my winter 2021 Practicum II course, focusing on our class discussions about assigned readings on social justice, antiracist teaching, and linguistic justice, and the degree to which these texts might be integrated into GTAs' work with students in our program's IC course. This teacher research study emphasizes students' voices, using dialogue from transcripts as a central vehicle for conveying the tensions GTAs feel between their investment in working with students on critical language awareness and linguistic diversity, the material demands of teaching IC, and their relative authority in their dual roles as both teachers and graduate students. Unlike other narratives of GTAs' experiences in the practicum, which capture their experiences prior to or during their first semester of teaching (e.g., Restaino 2012; Brewer 2020a), I present the experiences of GTAs in their fourth semester as doctoral students, in a second practicum course. This contextual distinction allows us to see the differences between the ways new and more advanced GTAs in a program might reflect on and operationalize curricular inquiries and changes. Further, capturing these experiences in an online practicum course, during our third "pandemic semester" and a continued season of searching for racial justice in our country, provides a picture of teacher development work during a culturally urgent and innovative time.

In the overall project I present in this book, while I attend to local examples of teacher development (in my home program and in the examples described to me by my interview participants), I listen to these examples as they pulse with values-laden energy and yet sometimes evince quiet sighs of exasperation and exhaustion, especially during the pandemic. In these examples of what it means to structure teacher development with vision and values in mind—even when these are implicit, tacit, or unspoken—I can hear echoes about labor, agency, and possibility that begin to synthesize into a meaningful next chorus. So it is that my project ends in this final chapter with a conversation with writing studies scholarship on writing program labor, change work in the discipline—and designing for this work—and on GTAs as change makers, to emphasize both how these essential program actors can be empowered through sites of teacher development to engage in values-based change making *and* how, through a clearer articulation of values, they may also be bolstered by a sense of sustainable, actionable hope. Drawing from the conclusions of each chapter, I demonstrate revisions to the texts and instruction of my practicum

course that aim to engage GTAs, practicum instructors, and other program personnel in the articulated, coordinating, and coordinated values-centered talk of teacher development and programmatic change.

Concluding Thoughts

In the span of time I conducted the studies of this book, the world was hit with the COVID-19 pandemic, our communities' devastated screams for justice seemed to finally begin to breach the too-long soundproof walls of white supremacy surrounding our schools, my local program shifted to wholly remote teaching and learning for a year, and we struggled with how to reconcile these larger contexts with what we were doing in our classroom (never mind the pervasive challenge of too many unprepared teachers teaching—or failing to teach—online, in life situations that made learning to teach online an impossibility of time and capacity) (see also Jankens and Guinot Varty 2025).

As I searched for shared values for teacher development, I learned also about how the ways we talk about our work in teacher development can make the articulation or manifestation of values more or less possible for writing program actors. Thus, across the chapters in this book, I trace two threads: the search for values for teacher development and the larger work of writing programs, and a developing understanding of both how we talk about this work and how we can talk about it better. Being able to better articulate our values for teacher development, the role teacher development plays in our local sites, and the ways that teacher development takes shape can better connect this central writing program activity to the values of the field at large, and therefore better equip teachers doing this work with ways to talk about and enact values-driven change in their classrooms and programs.

In all, I recognize the challenge of what I work to do in parts of this book and what I ask participants in my interview study in chapter 2 to do. Articulating a program's values at any one moment in time is akin to the challenge of capturing a snapshot of a writing program's identity; as Ritter (2018) notes, this work requires "being mindful of how important such declarations of identity and intent can be" (48). Indeed, my colleague Joe Torok and I felt this challenge, analyzing the values implicit in our own writing program's teaching observation form, and acknowledging these values to be both tacit and aspirational (Jankens and Torok 2023).

In this project, I take something I think I can pin down (teacher development in writing programs), consider it in light of the ever-present activity of

programmatic change, and use those common goals within and across programs to seek something too often less apparent: the explicit values of writing programs. Recognizing teacher development as core to the field—as itself one of the core values of the field—I hope this exploration illuminates and validates other values, helping us identify interconnections between the strategies we implement and sustain for the growth of our programs and their personnel. LaFrance (2019) asks about the work of sites of writing, “How does our work take shape?” (23), and I add these questions: How can we better attend to program values—and program values for teacher development—in this work? And how can we use articulation of those values to support the change work we hope to do?