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Well, here we are at the end of a very long year. Just like the world, at *Programmatic Perspectives*, we’ve been experiencing change. In October of 2019, Lora Arduser joined Susan Popham as co-editor, and Russell Kirkscey transitioned into the role of book review editor when former book review editor Joanna Schreiber stepped down. Susan Popham completed her editorial term in 2020, and Lee-Ann Kastman Breuch joined Lora as co-editor. We are grateful for all the work and guidance of Joanna and Susan in our transition and wish them well in their next endeavors!

We were also fortunate to have Chris Pasion, a graduate student in professional writing at the University of Cincinnati, join our team this year. Chris has been a miracle worker through his copyediting and desktop publishing skills and will be sorely missed when he graduates next spring.

One of the events Lee-Ann and Lora were fortunate enough to participate in this year was a series of Listening Sessions on antiracism hosted by Derek Ross of CDQ and attended by all the editors in the technical and professional communication field. From these sessions, we have gained insights about how to reach out and support both prospective authors and readers. We are eager to continue listening and trying new ways to be inclusive and promote social justice.

While we are excited about the coming year for the journal, we are equally excited to introduce issue 11.2 of *Programmatic Perspectives*. This issue includes a wonderful range of scholarship, including two articles that were the result of studies that received support from CPTSC Research Grants, each of which focuses on TPC programs
at under-investigated institutions: Hispanic-serving institutions and two-year colleges. The issue contains three original research articles, one program showcase, two commentaries, and three book reviews. We thank all the contributors of this issue.

The article “Locating Technical and Professional Communication at Two-Year Institutions” written by Kristin Marie Bivens, Timothy J. Elliott, and Gustav Karl Henrik Wiberg reports on a study that was awarded one of CPTSC’s 2018 research grants. In the article this team of investigators explores how an understanding of the TPC two-year college curricula impacts students in the field of TPC. The authors note that between more than one-third to over-half of undergraduate education happens at two-year colleges—looking at TPC at these institutions has a great deal to teach us. To give us a picture of what TPC curricula look like at these institutions, the authors gathered data on the number of TPC certificates, courses, concentrations, degrees, emphases, and programs and the academic departmental homes of these programs, degrees, and courses. The article will be instrumental in continuing to broaden our understandings of and conversations about TPC programs at these institutions.

In “Developing Technical & Professional Writing Programs at Hispanic-Serving Institutions,” Kendall Leon, Ann Shivers-McNair, and Laura Gonzales share results of a study of technical and professional writing instructors at 10 different Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs). This study, also a recipient of a CPTSC research grant, explores contextual factors at HSIs such as approaches, affordances, and limitations that may affect programmatic development. Using testimonio methodologies, the authors interviewed 11 instructors and coded interview data for common themes. Their findings suggest that HSI would benefit from more explicit curricular attention, and that best practices are often enacted by individual faculty members. Leon, Shivers-McNair, and Gonzales recommend structural changes and coalition-building among HSI institutions, and they underscore the importance of this work as technical and professional communication continues to expand and practice its commitment to inclusion and social justice.

Lindsay Steiner, Chris McCracken, and Marie Moeller’s article “The Minor is Major: An Adhocratic, Relationship-Based View of TPC Curriculum and Curriculum Revision” draws our attention to another under-explored administrative space, the TPC minor. The article details the author’s experiences in revising, recruiting, retaining, and connecting TPC minor students to networks within and external to their university in a case study that offers application options for other programs at other universities. Clearly, as the world and universities continue to
change and find it necessary to change faster and be more flexible, efforts at developing minors will be part of the mix.

The commentary “Complementing the Classroom: Building Productive Spaces for Technical and Professional Communication” was written by Carroll Ferguson Nardone, Brandon C. Strubberg, and Brian D. Blackburne. The commentary focuses on collaborative learning and approaches this subject through “the successes and the lessons” the authors learned during the two-plus years they theorized and planned a productive learning space, Iris. In the commentary, the authors define “productive” as the “convergence of theory, student-led exploration, and techne.”

A second commentary, “Dynamically Responsive Programmatic Design: A Framework for Identifying Pressures for Change,” outlines a framework for revising curriculum that upholds sustainability and innovation. Authors Kathleen M. Coffey, Angela Glotfelter, and Michele Simmons propose a proactive and iterative approach that bases curricular revisions on needs analyses from key faculty and student stakeholders. They illustrate this dynamic and responsive framework through an example of how one program revised a central course requirement in digital rhetoric. The authors recommend several strategies to pilot, support, and assess new curriculum using a dynamic approach.

The program showcase “A Different Kind of Outreach: George Washington University’s Professional Writing Training Program” by Jessica McCaughey describes an innovative program that serves external writers from corporate, non-profit, and government workplaces. McCaughey describes the origins and development of this program over the last eight years, which has culminated in a series of standardized workshops on topics including writing process, tone in professional writing, narrative workplace writing, copyediting, and online and social writing. McCaughey describes that “we’ve come to understand that writers in all types of organizations struggle with their writing” (p. 142). She notes that the workshops establish programmatic expertise in professional writing as well as revenue, but that the effort involves thought, continual assessment, and visibility within academic programs as well.

Finally, in this issue we have three book reviews. The first book review by G. Edzordzi Agbozo examines Isidore Kafui Dorpenyo’s User Localization Strategies in the Face of Technological Breakdown: Biometric in Ghana’s Elections. The second is John Misak’s review of Key Theoretical Frameworks: Teaching Technical Communication in the Twenty-First Century, edited by Angela M. Haas, Michelle F. Eble. The third book
review in this issue is written by Robert Terry, who reviews Benjamin Lauren's book *Communicating Project Management: A Participatory Rhetoric for Development Teams.*
Abstract. With only a handful of exceptions, recent programmatic and curricular research in technical and professional communication (TPC) has unwittingly excluded two-year institutions. In fact, TPC programmatic and curricular research at two-year colleges (2YCs) has stalled in the last 30 years. Our project updates baseline TPC knowledge about 2YC programs and curricula. Our research has revealed that TPC is alive and well at 2YCs. In addition to locating TPC at 2YCs geographically and institutionally in academic home departments, our findings indicate that 80% (n=990) of the 2YCs (n=1,235) we examined offer at least 1 TPC course. Further, we determined that 11% of these 2YCs had courses that function as standalone (n=113) and 75% as service courses (n=741). About 10% of 2YCs offer more than one TPC service course (n=97). Additionally, approximately 2% of 2YCs offered TPC emphases (n=20) and certificates (n=24) and about 1% feature concentrations (n=8), degrees (n=6), and programs (n=11). Our study provides a foundation for future studies about TPC at 2YC. Since 2YCs enroll somewhere between one-third to over one half of all undergraduate students, learning more about TPC at 2YCs is important for understanding TPC programs and curricula, field-wide. We suggest possibilities for building (and continuing) relationships between 2YCs and four-year institutions, and we preview future directions of 2YC TPC research that can help programmatic knowledge and research at 2YCs keep a similar pace with TPC research at four-year institutions, preventing an imbalance of information about TPC programs and curricula at 2YCs.

Keywords: curricular research, future directions, two-year colleges
As Joanna Schreiber, Melissa Carrion, and Jessica Lauer (2018) noted, “...technical and professional communication has been undergoing a period of extreme growth” (p. 2). Yet with certain exceptions (for example, Read & Michaud, 2018a), technical and professional communication (TPC) courses and faculty at Two-Year Colleges (2YC) have been a virtually unexamined and largely ignored sector of TPC. In fact, since a series of pioneering 2YC TPC studies about curriculum development (Brockman, 1979; 1981), teaching conditions (Pickett & Angelo, 1986a; 1986b), and courses and instructors (Pickett, 1990), programmatic and curricular knowledge about two-year institutions has stalled, while knowledge about undergraduate and graduate TPC curricula and programs at four-year institutions has grown (see Allen & Benninghoff, 2004; Harner & Rich, 2005; Melonçon, 2009; Melonçon & Henschel, 2013; Nugent, 2013; Schreiber & Melonçon, 2018; Yeats & Thompson, 2010). To the best of our knowledge, TPC curricular and programmatic research has been solely devoted to four-year institutions for almost the last 30 years.

We find this paucity of research about TPC at 2YC particularly concerning because between over one-third to over-half of undergraduate education happens at two-year colleges. According to data regarding undergraduate enrollment by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2020), in fall 2018, 10.9 million total undergraduates enrolled at four-year institutions, which is 65% of the national undergraduate student population (paras. 1-2). Consequently, the NCES (2020) claimed that 5.7 million undergraduates, or 35% of the national undergraduate student population, enrolled at two-year institutions (para. 2). The Community College Research Center (CCRC) at Columbia University’s Teachers College interpreted the NCES statistics differently by including the nearly 100 Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) reclassified 2YCs. IPEDS recategorized nearly 100 baccalaureate granting 2YCs as four-year institutions1 (Fink & Jenkins, 2020, para. 4). With the inclusion of reclassified IPEDS 2YCs, the CCRC estimated that “nearly 10 million students enrolled at a community college at some point during the 2017-18 academic year,” bringing the percentage closer to half of total undergraduate enrollment (para. 4). Additionally, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC; 2020) reported a combination of almost 7 million students between

---

1 According to John Fink and Davis Jenkins (2020), “community colleges . . . enrolled over 2 and a half million more students than public four-years did in that year [2016-2017]” (para. 5). These data suggest, though, that classification and accuracy are issues regarding reporting enrollment across two-year and four-year institutions.
full-time and part-time enrollment (n.p.), suggesting 41% of undergraduates were enrolled at 2YCs in fall 2018. According to the AACC (2020), of those roughly 41% undergraduate students, 1% are Native American, 26% are Latinx, 13% are Black, 6% are Asian/Pacific Islanders, and 4% are biracial (n.p.).

With a diverse demographic of students, these organizations estimate between over one-third to over one-half of undergraduates attend either private or public two-year institutions or 2YCs. The research problem arises then that our field has had an incomplete understanding of the kinds of TPC curricula offered to a substantial number—and by one account, the majority—of undergraduates, which also means that little is currently known about these students’ impact on the field of TPC, including what and how they are taught.

Although some recent research has included TPC at 2YCs, our project updates and re-establishes a baseline of information about TPC curricula exclusively at 2YCs. For example, Dale Sullivan (1997), and to an extent Jim Nugent (2013) and Sarah Read and Michael Michaud (2018a), have mapped undergraduate TPC curricula, certificates, and programs. Still, the majority of TPC programmatic research from the mid-1990’s to the present has almost focused solely on four-year institutions (see Allen & Benninghoff, 2004; Harner & Rich, 2005; Melonçon, 2009; Melonçon & Henschel, 2013; Yeats & Thompson, 2010). In order to provide a more complete picture of the students TPC serves and the 2YC contexts that they learn in, our project reports an updated and foundational overview of TPC certificates, courses, concentrations, degrees, emphases, and programs across 2YCs in the United States.²

In the sections to come, we review relevant 2YC programmatic and curricular research, explain our methodology, and reveal the major findings of our study. Then, we provide suggestions for learning more about TPC and TPC at 2YCs. In the process, we argue for efforts to enhance institutional bridges and collaborations between 2YCs and four-year institutions (à la Melonçon & Henschel, 2013; Pickett, 1990). And finally, we discuss our findings within the context of the growth of TPC at both 2YCs and four-year institutions.

A Paucity of Current Two-Year College Curricular and Programmatic Research

Although recent TPC research has included 2YCs in their composites (e.g., Nugent, 2013; Read & Michaud, 2018a), most 2YC TPC research is outdated. In “Technical Communication in the Two-Year College: A Survey,” Nell Ann Pickett and Faye Angelo (1986a) reported the findings

² Our study was funded by a generous Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication research grant (AY 2018-2019).
from a national survey that gathered information about technical communication at 2YCs (p. 126). Pickett and Angelo reported 16 associate degrees and 10 certificate programs (n=26), as well as 2 colleges that were developing programs (p. 129).

Dale Sullivan’s (1997) “Two-Year College Programs” chapter is the most recent scholarship solely devoted to the state of TPC at 2YCs. In it, he presents general characteristics of select TPC programs at 2YCs, including these programs’ diversity and variety, as well as their associate degree or certificate offerings. Sullivan also noted required coursework, home departments, and relationships with general education requirements (p. 169-172). From Sullivan’s study over 20 years ago, we can determine that TPC programs at 2YCs were impacted by budgetary considerations and fluctuated in prominence (pp. 180-181). In any case, the data from these studies is outdated and suggests that a more solid foundation for learning about TPC at 2YC is needed, and that is the baseline our work now provides.

More recently, Nugent (2013) attempted to establish the state of TPC certificates. In 2008, he surveyed program administrators (Nugent, 2009). Applicable to 2YCs, the writing certificate survey sample (n = 114) only included institutions that had either a baccalaureate technical or professional writing degree or certificate (Nugent, 2009; Nugent 2013). Yet, Nugent’s (2013) sample included several nominally professional writing programs that he acknowledged “appeared to offer more preparation in creative, literary, or dramatic writing” (p. 67). Although Nugent (2009) did not account for 2YCs specifically (he reported his findings in aggregate3), based on our examination of his work, 14 2YCs returned the survey he administered (pp. 150-171); these comprised 24% of his total responses (Nugent, 2013, p. 68). In other words, despite Nugent’s attempts to take a broad view of technical and professional writing programs, only 14 of the 2YCs who have TPCs courses and programs (e.g., Austin Community College in Texas and College of Lake County in Illinois) returned surveys and were reported in Nugent’s composite.

Despite the limitations of his survey of U.S. certificate programs in technical communication, Nugent (2013) pointed out the substantial growth and “great popularity” of technical communication certificate programs in prior years (p. 60). As a point of contrast, just over twenty years earlier, Sullivan (1997) concluded, “Technical communication programs in two-year colleges seem to flicker to life, exist on the books

3 We counted the 2YCs from an appendix of Nugent’s dissertation. We are grateful to Nugent for his willingness to correspond with us regarding our project in relation to his previous research.
for a couple years, and then pass away” (p. 180). Sullivan then added “... many programs are proposed and instituted, but few of them turn into vibrant programs, and fewer still survive in the long term” (p. 181). In Nugent’s (2013) survey of all manner of TPC certificate programs, he critiqued recent TPC programmatic and curricular scholarship and remarked, “Each study has also made assumptions about ‘what counts’ as a program for the purposes of their research, and has assumed programs that ‘count’ were adequately represented in their samples” (p. 63). In fact, Katherine Staples (1997) remarked in her chapter, “Two-Year College Technical Communication Programs: Toward the Future,” that “For all their potential, despite some successes, two-year college programs in technical communication are surprisingly underrepresented in program surveys” (p. 265). However, a contributing reason for this underrepresentation might be Sullivan’s (1997) claim that TPC programs fail to thrive at 2YCs as well as an absence of common curricular and programmatic terminology.

In Table 1, we report TPC program numbers from other studies since 1981. To account for the fluctuations (both increases and decreases in TPC program numbers), studies by Thomas E. Pearsall, Frances J. Sullivan, and Earl E. McDowell (1981) and Patrick M. Kelley, Roger E. Masse, Pearsall, and Sullivan (1985) might have depended on survey responses solely; survey responses are self-reported and therefore not totally reliable for tallying the complete number of TPC programs at 2YCs (as cited in Staples, 1997, pp. 265-266). This reliance on survey responses might account for the jump from four TPC programs in 1981 to 26 TPC programs in 1986 (and other such fluctuations). However, the reported decrease from 26 programs in 1986 to 11 in 1993 can likely be attributed to

- a decrease in TPC programs at 2YCs,
- an incomplete 2YC TPC program reporting,
- an absence of a common curricular lexicon, and
- some combination of these factors.
Table 1: Reported TPC programs at 2YCs over the years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Reported TPC Programs at 2YCs</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pearsall, Sullivan, and McDowell(^1)</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kelley, Masse, Pearsall, and Sullivan(^1)</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26(^2)</td>
<td>Pickett and Angelo</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Geonetta, Allen, Curtis, and Staples(^1)</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38(^*)</td>
<td>Bivens, Elliott, and Wiberg</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\)Bivens, Elliott, and Wiberg (2020) include 2YCs with TPC certificates, degrees, and programs in their total.

1. As reported in Staples (1997; p. 265-266).
2. Pickett and Angelo (1986) reported both degrees and programs from 23 institutions (p. 129).

Our reported number of 41 programs includes certificates, degrees, and programs—all terms 2YCs used to describe their programmatic curricula. However, we are uncertain, unless otherwise noted, if prior programmatic studies defined and counted programmatic offerings in the same way.

Although recent research on TPC (e.g., Nugent, 2013; Read & Michaud, 2018a) commingles curricular information about TPC from four-year and two-year institutions, the generally outdated quality of research solely devoted to the state of TPC at 2YCs (e.g., Pickett, 1979; Sullivan, 1997) have rendered it superannuated and, unfortunately, obsolete. And so, in addition to the research problem our work addresses, we strive to revive scholarly interest in the state of TPC at 2YCs that was spurred by Pickett over forty years ago. To do so, we build upon existing data gathering methods used to learn about the programmatic state of TPC curricula and share foundational data about TPC at 2YCs. Next, we describe the data gathering method that we used to study the research problem. The research problem prompted us to explore what 2YCs offered TPC programs and classes, what kinds of programs
and classes were offered, and what academic departments sponsored these programs and classes.

**Data Gathering Method**

Our research team comprised of three faculty researchers, one graduate student, and two paid undergraduate student research assistants. The data presented here are part of a larger content analysis that identified and updated curricular and programmatic information about TPC courses at 2YCs. The general research question guiding our project included “What is the state of TPC at 2YCs?” From this orientation, we sought answers to the following research questions:

- How many TPC certificates, courses, concentrations, degrees, emphases, and programs (i.e., curricula) exist at 2YCs (Nugent, 2013; Pickett & Angelo, 1986a; Pickett, 1990; Staples, 1997)?
- In what academic departments are TPC curricula housed at 2YCs (Sullivan, 1997)?
- Do TPC courses at 2YCs function as service or standalone courses (Read & Michaud, 2018a; Schreiber, Carrion, & Lauer, 2018)?

As Staples (1997) pointed out, “Social and economic changes have always shaped the two-year college,” as have local or community considerations in tandem “With varying combinations of district, state, and federal support . . .” (p. 261) or, another way, legislative interference, reforms, and mandates. For these reasons, 2YC curricula (e.g., developmental education) and practices and policies (e.g., writing placement assessment) are susceptible to state mandated legislative influence and reforms (Two-Year College Association, 2016, p. 1). Two-year institutions are more easily shaped by the communities they serve, as well as by state-level legislative oversight and non-government organizations (NGO). Hence, we approached the project geographically. To do so, we used the seven Conference on College Composition and

---

4 We acknowledge Jessica Ulmer’s contributions designing the study, collecting data, and general work on the project.

5 We gratefully acknowledge Yocelyn Cabañas’s and Qahir Muhammad’s work as research assistants (RAs) collecting data for the project. Emanating from our commitment to paying students working as research assistants a fair wage, both undergraduate RAs were paid $15/hour for their work on this project. The source of the $15/hour was the aforementioned CPTSC research grant. And the entirety of the CPTSC research grant went to compensate the undergraduate student RAs for their work on this project.

6 We suspect the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic will shape 2YCs, too; however, it is too soon to know how.
Communication (CCCC) Two-Year College Association (TYCA) regions (see Table 2) as a guide to identify public 2YC. We initially gathered data on institutions in the seven TYCA regions; we excluded Canadian provinces and included Washington DC.\(^7\) Then, we gathered data from private 2YC.\(^8\)

In total, we identified and extracted TPC data from 1,235 public (n=951) and private (n=284) not-for-profit two-year institutions. We intentionally excluded for-profit private 2YC because of their propensity to close\(^9\) and well-earned suspicions of their inherent value to learners. In total, we gathered over 15,000 data points. To collect these data points and collaborate both asynchronously and synchronously, we used a combination of hyperlinked Google Docs and Sheets.

**Table 2: Two-Year College Association Regions, states, and total of 2YC in each region.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>2YC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Arkansas, Colorado, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Arizona, Hawaii, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We defined a *course* as a discrete unit of study at the individual class level (e.g., an Introduction to Technical Communication course).

\(^7\) We combined Southern Idaho from the West region with Northern Idaho in the Pacific Northwest region.

\(^8\) We acknowledge Jessica Ulmer’s contributions collecting the names of these private, not-for-profit 2YC.

\(^9\) Since 2013, 95.5% of all colleges that have closed have been for-profit (Newton, 2018, para. 9).
Programs consist of a series of TPC courses that, when taken together, result in a credential (i.e., an associate degree or a certificate). Programs of study might be devoted to a degree or certificate within a particular subject matter area. Within a program, certain courses can be taken in conjunction with general education requirements to earn a degree (e.g., an associates of art or an associates of applied science); or, among several subject matter areas as an emphasis; or, from a selection of courses within a particular subject matter area as a concentration. Certificates are a selection of courses from one or more subject matter areas that might be academic or professional, but likely designed for those directly entering the workforce. Since students who study at 2YCs might strive to earn a credential like a certificate or associates degree in two years, TPC curricula and programs at 2YCs can vary in their use of terminology from four-year institutions, especially since state legislatures often play a role in shaping curricular offerings (e.g., Illinois and Florida). With these definitions in mind, Sullivan’s (1997) description is helpful to show the connections between these degree, program, and certificate curricular offerings:

The degree option usually involves taking specialized technical communication courses, picking up a minor concentration in technical communication, and fulfilling the college’s general education courses, whereas the certificate option is a stripped down version of the degree, requiring that the student take only the specialized courses within technical communication. (p. 170)

These distinctions and curricular relationships are important for understanding community college or 2YC contexts, especially since these programmatic and curricular offerings’ credentials can ideally be earned in fewer than two years.

A baseline of knowledge about TPC courses at 2YCs is required to determine TPC programmatic growth. To attempt to establish a current baseline, we relied on the kinds of data Pickett and Angelo (1986a; 1986b) collected. Pickett and Angelo assembled information about any type of TPC-related program or curricula at 2YCs. They compiled a list of 1,202 2YCs in May 1984-July 1985 and surveyed those 2YCs to gather:

- information about enrollment,
- number of TPC courses and teachers,
- number of years TPC offered,
- prerequisites,
- substitution for first year writing,
- purpose of TPC courses,
• transferability and articulation of coursework,
• department information,
• textbook information,
• major units of study, and
• institutional priority of TPC coursework.

Out of 1,202 2YCs, Pickett and Angelo (1986a) received responses from 897 schools for a roughly 75% response rate (p. 126). About 300 of the 897 (roughly 33%) reported they did not have TPC programs (p. 126). Further, some 2YCs were uncertain if their courses were TPC (p. 126). Therefore, their now 30-year-old survey and analysis included 565 2YCs (roughly 63% of responding 2YCs) that reported some version of TPC courses (p. 126).

In order to address the research problem, we used an approach similar to Lisa Melonçon and Sally Henschel’s (2013) and Melonçon’s (2009; 2012) processes for gauging undergraduate TPC degrees. We also incorporated elements of Dave Yeats and Isabelle Thompson’s (2010) focus on locating institutional academic departments, though we collected data through publicly available websites, not surveys. We avoided issues related to survey response rates and accurate programmatic representations (see Table 1) by using digital gathering methods and content search strategies to identify 2YCs and their course offerings. Our research approach included two phases: identifying public and private not-for-profit 2YCs (phase 1) and gathering courses and other TPC curricular and programmatic information from those 2YCs using digital course catalogs and institutional web pages (phase 2).

Phase 1 identified 2YCs across the United States and extracted particular information and data from those 2YCs (i.e., digitally available course catalogs, institutional web pages, and other online resources). After identifying relevant 2YCs, we then located each state’s 2YC or educational oversight and regulatory agency (e.g., Illinois Community College Board or Nebraska Community Colleges Association). We reasoned that we would be able to find complete lists of all 2YCs through these state oversight and regulatory agencies; however, private not-for-profit institutions were not included on these lists, which resulted in our team eventually repeating phase 1 and phase 2 of our research process to collect data on these institutions.

Phase 2 extracted course information through textual analysis from the digitally available course catalogs, institutional web pages, and other online resources that we gathered and linked to on a series of Google Sheets in phase 1. For example, our textual analysis located kinds of courses, standalone or service course status, and academic/
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department location. Table 3 shows the goals at-a-glance of both phase 1 and phase 2, respectively.

**Table 3: The two phases of our data collection process and brief descriptions of the actions we took to locate the information we sought to identify for each 2YC.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Gathering Phase</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Phase 1**          | • provide the city, college URL, course catalog URL, and PDF  
                      | • download PDF and upload course catalog PDF to state Google Folder |
|                      | • select course catalog year  
                      | • repeat for 2YC in each state in all 7 regions |
|                      | • choose the appropriate region and state  
                      | • identify the states’ educational oversight/regulatory entity  
                      | • retrieve states’ educational oversight/regulatory entity’s list of 2YCs |
|                      | • input 2YC’s name  
                      | • add 2YC to 2YC master list on appropriate state tab |
| **Phase 2**          | • select the appropriate labels from the Google Sheet drop down menu:  
                      | course offered  
                      | emphasis offered  
                      | concentration offered  
                      | degree offered  
                      | certificate offered  
                      | program offered  
                      | department curricula offered  
                      | service course for college  
                      | URL to validate department home service course designation |
|                      | • choose the appropriate region and state  
                      | • locate the 2YC URL or course catalog PDF |
|                      | • search course catalog PDFs and URLs using the following terms:  
                      | technical writing  
                      | technical communication  
                      | professional writing  
                      | professional communication  
                      | business writing  |

The research team conducted thematic content analyses of digital college catalogs and if catalogs were unavailable, information from 2YCs’ websites, which contain publicly available information about certificates, courses, concentrations, degrees, emphases and/or programs state-by-state (Melonçon & Henschel, 2013, pp. 46-47; Melonçon, 2012, pp. 208-209). Following Melonçon (2012) and Melonçon and Henschel’s (2013) method, we opted to examine course catalogs because they are “the official declaration of an institution’s programs and curricula” that “[serve] as a quasi-legal contract between the institution and a student” (Melonçon, 2012, p. 208; Melonçon & Henschel, 2013, pp. 46-47) and an “institutional artifact” (Melonçon, 2012, p. 208; Melonçon & Henschel, 2013, p. 47) that is easily accessible digitally for
researchers in contexts like ours. We replicated parts of Melonçon’s (2012) and Melonçon & Henschel’s (2013) research method when, state-by-state, we saved local PDF copies of the most recent course catalogs we located. When a course catalog was not available as a PDF, we used the 2YC’s website to determine if there were TPC curricular or programmatic offerings.

Our research team stored the findings on closed Google Docs and Sheets. Members of the research team logged data region by region, state by state, and 2YC by 2YC. After an initial round of data collection focused on course catalogs for the 2018-2019 school year, our research team recorded several relevant data points including institution type, region, and curricular offerings (see Table 3 for specifics). After the research team collected data for phase 1, we checked each other’s work in phase 2 by only having team members collect phase 2 data for states that the team member did not tally in phase 1. To promote accurate data collection, we used cell range data validation rules. After collection, we validated data for phases 1 and 2 by distilling and correlating the data points using tools embedded in Excel, like summation and COUNTIF functions to test data entry accuracy, and downloading our data to use locally in Excel.

Two-Year College Technical and Professional Communication Data Findings

Our findings indicate that TPC, primarily as a service course, is alive and well at 2YCs. Specifically, our findings show that:

- 80% of the 2YCs we examined offer at least one TPC course (n=990), and
- 85% of those 2YCs with TPC courses offer it as a service course (n=838).

2YC academic policies (e.g., placement testing) and curricula (e.g., developmental education) are increasingly shaped by regional factors, including state legislative influence, local government mandates, and curricular reforms, as well as regional accrediting bodies. For these reasons, we also located TPC geographically throughout the United States and pinpointed TPC in 2YCs, departmentally. We suggest the geographic and academic unit locations will be important contexts to consider for future studies. To that end, we found that:

- the West region of the United States has the highest percentage of 2YCs offering TPC courses at 91%,
- the Northeast region has the lowest percentage (60%), and
• 20% (n= 238) of 2YCs with TPC housed the courses in Business departments.

Certificates, Courses, Concentrations, Degrees, Emphases, and Programs. The bulk of TPC curriculum at 2YCs is present in TPC courses, whether stand-alone or service courses. According to Melonçon and Peter England (2011), service courses are “introductory courses for nonmajors delivered primarily as a service to other departments and programs . . . designed to better prepare students for the writing they will do on the job . . . “(p. 398). Service courses are “rich locations for program administrators, instructors, and researchers to ask and test central questions” about TPC (Schreiber, Carrion, & Lauer, 2018, p. 1). In Read and Michaud’s (2018b) discussion of the introduction to professional writing course, which they term “multimajor professional writing courses,” the authors make the case that the introduction to TPC course are typically taken as “. . . service classes by students from across the university at all levels of degree completion and often also as electives by English or Writing majors and minors” (p. 228). Of the 1,235 2YCs we examined, 80% (n=990) had at least one TPC course offering. Based on what we could determine using our data gathering method, 11% of these 990 2YCs had courses that function as standalone (n=113) and 75% as service courses (n=741).

About 10% of 990 2YCs offer more than one TPC service course (n=97). However, of the 990 2YCs with TPC courses, our research uncovered approximately 2% offered TPC emphases (n=20) and certificates (n=24) and about 1% feature concentrations (n=8) and degrees (n=6). As a point of comparison, according to Melonçon (2019), about 2% (n=87) of the NCES reported 4,583 four-year institutions offered bachelor’s degrees in TPC (n.p.). Similarly, about 2% (n=115) of four-year institutions offer degrees with a TPC emphasis, about 3% (n=143) feature TPC minors, and about 2% (n=75) offer TPC undergraduate certificates (Melonçon, 2019, n.p.).

Furthermore, in our analysis of these course catalogs (either online or PDF) and 2YC websites, we found TPC programs (n=11), are concentrated in the Midwest region of the United States (n=6), particularly Illinois (n=3). In total, 7% (n=69) of 2YCs with TPC courses (n=990) have structured their TPC curricula into either an emphasis or concentration and curricula resulting in a credential or degree, certificate, and/or program. These findings are further distilled in Table 4 below.
Table 4: Findings of TPC-related programmatic and curricular offerings at 2YCs from 1,235 2YCs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of 2YCs</th>
<th>Percentage out of 990 2YCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphases</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical and Professional Communication as a Service Course. Melonçon and Henschel (2013) defined the service course as “introductory courses to the practice of technical and professional writing and communication” (p. 51). As reported earlier, the bulk of TPC curricula at 2YCs is present in TPC courses. Those TPC courses are either stand-alone, service courses, or, based on our analysis, undetermined. In fact, we found that 990 2YCs had at least one TPC course offering; and of the 2YCs with TPC course offerings, 75% had a single TPC course as a service course (n=741) and 10% (n=97) offered more than one TPC service course. In total, 85% (n=838) of the 990 2YCs offered TPC service courses, 11% (n=113) offered stand-alone TPC courses, and 4% (n=39) offered courses that could not be determined.

Geographic Location. Keeping with Pickett and Angelo’s (1986a; 1986b) geographic organization of certificates, degrees, and programs by region, Table 5 provides a regional breakdown, which shows the areas where 2YC’s TPC courses are located. Notably, 91% of 2YCs in the West (i.e., California) and 87% of 2YCs in the Southwest and Pacific Coast regions, respectively, offer at least one TPC course. Furthermore, 60% of 2YCs in the Northeast offer at least one TPC course.
Table 5: Two-Year College Association region, number of 2YCs examined by region, total number of TPC courses by region, and percentage of 2YCs offering TPC by region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Number of 2YCs in the Region</th>
<th>Number of 2YCs with TPC Courses</th>
<th>Percentage of 2YCs in Region with TPC Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 includes the region, the state, course, and total of TPC types offered. Although 80% (n=990) of the 2YCs organized by region and state that follow offer at least one TPC course at a 2YC, only 7% (n=69) of those 990 2YCs offer the course as part of a certificate, concentration, degree, emphasis, and/or program. As a point of contrast, 32% (n=10) of the 2YCs in Michigan (n=31) that offer TPC courses, provide a certificate, concentration, degree, emphasis, and/or program; similarly, in Virginia, of the 2YCs offering TPC (n=21), 29% (n=6) provide a TPC certificate, concentration, degree, emphasis, and/or program.

Table 6: TPC Courses and other TPC Offerings by region and state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of 2YCs with TPC Courses</th>
<th>Number of 2YCs with TPC Curricula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Locating</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pacific Coast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Locating</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Northwest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Locating</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Southeast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Locating</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Southwest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Locating</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**West**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Locating</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai’i</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Departmental or Academic Unit Location. Nugent’s (2013) expansive data set reported the majority of TPC certificates are typically housed in English/Language and Literature (43%) departments followed by Technical Communication (23%), Communication (6%), Writing (6%), and Humanities (9%) departments (p. 70). Our findings (see Figure 1) showed that although 63% of 2YC with TPC courses house the course offerings in English departments (n=623), 26% of TPC courses exist in Business departments (n=260). Additionally, 4% of TPC courses are located in Communication departments (n=42) and 2% in Writing Studies departments (n=24), respectively. Furthermore, 4% (n=41) of TPC courses are offered in other departments (e.g., Computer Information Systems, Technical Communications, General Studies, Criminal Justice, and Information Technology).

In terms of academic home departments, TPC at 2YCs are seemingly not on par with four-year institutions. Although the majority of technical communication certificates, degrees, and programs in short the “majority of technical communication educational programs . . . [had been] housed in English departments” (MacNealy & Heaton, 1999, p. 42), Melonçon and Henschel (2013) reported only 34% of TPC programs were housed in various kinds of English departments (e.g., English and Language and Literature) (emphasis added; p. 55). Future studies might strive to locate all curricular types (i.e., concentrations, emphases, etc.) of TPC at 2YCs, especially since the home academic department’s location within the college might impact curricula and programs as noted by Marjorie T. Davis (2001). Understanding TPC curricula at 2YCs will need to account for and contextualize the academic and regional geographic placement since 2YCs are influenced by social and economic circumstances (Staples, 1997, p. 261), which is just as true today, as it was nearly 25 years ago.

Figure 1: TPC courses’ home department location at the 2YC.
Re-Establishing Technical and Professional Communication Baseline Knowledge at Two-Year Colleges

In this section, we explain how our research re-establishes baseline TPC knowledge at 2YCs. In the process, we suggest possibilities for building (and continuing) relationships between 2YCs and four-year institutions, and we preview future directions of 2YC TPC research. Similar to Melonçon and Henschel (2013), we encountered a lack of recent programmatic scholarship about TPC curriculum. In our case, TPC at 2YC research did not have a firm baseline for comparison nor a comprehensive list of 2YCs throughout the nation. However, by working to create a baseline of knowledge about TPC at 2YCs, we assembled a comprehensive list of 2YCs (see Appendix A).

Locating Technical and Professional Communication at Two-Year Colleges. Because existing data was outdated, we deemed all prior findings regarding the state of TPC at 2YCs insufficient to address our current research problem. However, the lack of current information provided the impetus for our study and an opportunity to recreate and rediscover TPC curricular information at 2YCs. Furthermore, although NCES’s College Navigator has a state by state database to search for various kinds of higher education institutions (e.g., for-profit four-year university) by program type (e.g., professional, technical, business, and scientific writing), we were interested in all TPC curricula—from course to program. As we collected data, we also recorded the names, locations, and URLs of all public and private not-for-profit 2YCs, as well as their TPC curricular offerings. In the end, we had curated a list of 2YCs with TPC curricula, and we had created a region by region and state by state organized list of all public and private not for profit 2YCs in the country.

To begin to understand TPC at 2YCs, a baseline for knowing where these curricula and programs exist was paramount. As Schreiber and Melonçon (2019) suggested, programmatic TPC perspectives offer a . . . critical review of programs involving careful deliberation on the nature of programs to better understand how and why they exist and work. Effectively engaging in such activities involves understanding that TPC programs are both locally situated and shaped by field-wide trends in academia and industry. (p. 254)

With a baseline or basic understanding of TPC curricula and certificates, degrees, and programs at 2YCs, our knowledge about TPC field-wide trends can become even more well-rounded. Our project shares an updated baseline for future studies—both for those that examine the TPC field and TPC at 2YCs.
However, we are cautious about relying upon existing 2YC data. For example, Sullivan (1997) reported 28 TPC programs at 2YCs. Using Sullivan’s finding (n=28) for comparison, our analysis found a reduction in TPC programs (n=11), yet perhaps issues with consistent curricular and programmatic terminology across 2YCs might mean there are possibly more programs when adding degrees (n=6) and certificates (n=24) to our total. Including degrees and certificates in the program count for a total of 41 TPC certificates, degrees, and programs suggests a potential increase of 32% over the last nearly 25 years. When compared to the reported 131% growth (Melonçon & Henschel, 2013) from 80 four-year undergraduate programmatic and curricular offerings (Harner & Rich, 2005) to 185 TPC programmatic and curricular offerings (Melonçon & Henschel, 2013), this potential 32% increase in TPC programs, degrees, and certificates or curricula that results in a credential (e.g., associate degree or certificate) at 2YCs should be investigated beyond our study. However, we cautiously make these comparisons. Moving forward, though, our findings can function as both an update to the previous studies and a baseline for future projects examining TPC at 2YCs.

When we began to locate TPC at 2YCs, we faced an issue common to curricular and programmatic research: the absence of a master list of institutions that have TPC courses and programs. In our case, we could not locate a single master list of 2YCs throughout the United States. We were eventually able to locate public 2YCs and then private not-for-profit 2YCs via state educational oversight and regulatory agencies with guidance from CCCC and NCES. Having to turn to several organizations to create lists of schools or programs is not a unique issue related to programmatic research in TPC (see Melonçon, 2012; Melonçon & Henschel, 2013), and creating a comprehensive list seems to be a consistently cumbersome process. However, to help to set the stage for future studies, we provided a state by state comprehensive list of private and public not-for-profit 2YCs in Appendix A. Creating this list was time-intensive, as programmatic and curricular research in TPC tends to be, yet we hope our list will prove fruitful for building institutional bridges and promoting collaborations between 2YCs and four-year institutions.

**Collaborating Across Institutions: Bridges from Two-Year Colleges and Connecting to Four-Year Institutions.** Locating TPC at 2YCs means more possibilities to bridge institution types and encourage collaborations between two-year and four-year institutions. Like

---

10 We anticipate that the COVID-19 pandemic will shape this list in the coming years and decades.
the collaboration Marion G. Barchilon and Donald G. Kelly (1995) described between Arizona State University and South Mountain Community College in their NSF-funded project that “… developed and piloted a flexible technical communication education model …” (as cited in Staples, 1997, p. 269), we re-focus attention on such collaborations. As Staples (1997) noted, “Better collaboration between academic programs at every level also provides possibilities for research partnerships” (p. 268). In fact, our project was a collaboration between two-year and four-year college faculty (and students). Of importance, though, with certain exceptions, full-time teaching loads at 2YC for writing courses are usually upwards of four to five courses per semester (and for those who teach part-time, those numbers can vary from 1-8 or even more). Course-level and programmatic research might not be prioritized when teaching loads are higher, and active research agendas are not incentivized (Staples, 1997). However, by locating TPC at 2YCs, we rediscovered, updated, and demarcated the state of TPC at 2YCs. By illuminating the current state of TPC at 2YCs, we have provided a foundation for any potential collaboration between two- and four-year institutions, faculty, and students, as well as opportunities to spur additional efforts (when working conditions permit) to study what TPC looks like throughout all of undergraduate education.

To be blunt, curricular and programmatic research is time consuming and challenging, yet likely to impact the field’s understanding of TPC curricula in undergraduate education in important ways. Without our collaborative efforts across institution types, it is unlikely that we would have either undertaken or completed such an ambitious project. To collect and manage our data, we built the infrastructure to collaboratively collect over 15,000 data points as we worked as a research team of six. Through formal and informal collaborations between two-year and four-year institutions like ours, there is the potential for research teams to build upon the baseline we have provided here and conduct more inclusive, comprehensive programmatic TPC research.

Those willing to undertake TPC programmatic or curricular research at 2YCs might consider analyzing student demographic data about transfer status and enrollment in TPC programs at four-year institutions. Researchers collecting curricular or programmatic data at four-year institutions might ask students to share if they: 1) transferred from a 2YC, 2) took TPC coursework at their previous institution, and/or 3) attended a 2YC in a particular state. Questions like these might help to ascertain trends regarding student enrollment at 2YCs, transfer to four-year institutions, and enrollment in TPC certificate and degree programs and other curricula. This kind of research can strengthen
or even establish articulation agreements between institution types. Furthermore, it is likely that 2YC feeder schools, or the schools transfer students primarily matriculate from, will be represented in the answers to these questions (e.g., the seven City Colleges of Chicago are 2YCs located throughout Chicago and serve as the major feeder schools to the University of Illinois-Chicago). By locating 2YC TPC students, four-year institutions can target their recruitment efforts at these feeder schools and other likely 2YC transfer institutions, while reinforcing existing bridges, providing opportunities to collaborate, and developing articulation agreements for transfer credits.

To encourage valuable TPC programmatic research at 2YCs, we suggest collaborations between faculty at two-year and four-year institutions that would allow all involved to better understand TPC service courses and their relationship to the field. To start, we suggest a survey of learning outcomes and/or assignment requirements, like Francis (2018) conducted. In response to valid survey study critiques from Melonçon (2018) and Melonçon, Jeremy Rosselot-Merritt, and Kirk St.Amant (2020), this kind of survey study should then incorporate additional data collection methods that are appropriate for the research questions (e.g., interviews and focus groups) to triangulate responses. In the process, using mixed methods to triangulate initial survey responses might help the field understand the content offered in these courses beyond what TPC faculty self-report. Alternatively, an update to Sullivan (1997) and profiles of the existing TPC 2YC certificates and degree programs might further investigate each program’s goals, relationships with industry and other academic departments, and course offerings (Schreiber & Melonçon, 2019). Our project locates TPC at 2YCs; we invite other scholars to contribute to mapping that terrain, while collaborating across institution types.

Pedagogically, graduate TPC programs might emphasize 2YC TPC as a topic to consider when evaluating current course offerings that prioritize teaching TPC at four-year institutions. As a field, we know TPC graduates teach at a variety of institution types (e.g., private and public; two-year and four-year institutions). We encourage TPC graduate program administrators to consider how they are preparing graduate students for teaching beyond four-year institutions. For example, DePaul University offers a Teaching English in Two-Year Colleges Graduate Certificate (TETYCGC). If a similar Teaching Technical and Professional Communication in Two-Year Colleges’ certificate, coursework, or program were offered, it is likely to draw from existing graduate student populations, as well as engage with new ones throughout the University. In fact, the TETYCGC requires an internship for DePaul University.
graduate students with a 2YC instructor. At institutions with established TPC graduate programs, a similar TPC certificate for teaching at 2YCs (like at DePaul University) or required internship with a 2YC faculty, that offers compensation for the 2YC faculty member, might also help entice 2YC faculty, empower graduate students, and create a bridge between two- and four-year institutions. Creating substantial bridges across institutions would require collaboration, coordination, and pedagogical innovation with a particular focus on TPC instructor preparation. We certainly recognize these kinds of internships might not be possible given two-year and four-year specific institutional contexts, existing labor commitments, departmental conditions, institutional relationships, and service course priorities. However challenging logistically, if possible, cross-institutional collaborations would likely be worthwhile and potentially impactful, field-wide.

**Forecasting Two-Year College Technical and Professional Communication Research: National Organization Involvement and Potential Collaborative Directions.** Based on his analysis of successful TPC programs at 2YCs, Sullivan (1997) conveyed the importance of 2YCs involvement in national TPC organizations (p. 181). Specifically, Staple (1997) makes a similar claim that although 2YCs are known to reflect the communities they serve, many faculty are not actively involved as members or leaders in disciplinary communities or with national organizations like the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication (CPTSC), the Association of Teachers of Technical Writing (ATTW), and the Society for Technical Communication (STC). Without continued and persistent efforts to engage, TPC faculty at 2YCs will remain mostly disconnected from the development of TPC at four-year institutions. We recognize that these organizations have made attempts to reach out to 2YC faculty in the past, but, as we argue elsewhere (Bivens, Elliott, & Wiberg, 2020), TPC professional organizations serve as unique sites for coalition building and should continue their coalition-building work in this way.

According to the CPTSC, 2YC faculty make up less than 5% of the CPTSC membership (n=195). Further, the ATTW reported 5% 2YC members. The STC includes an academic special interest group (SIG) and student chapters but does not track institution type of their members.

---

11 Over the last decade and a half, Bivens has created space for and welcomed DePaul interns in her 2YC classroom for several semesters.

12 Information was provided via email from Lisa Melonçon on April 16, 2019.

13 Information was provided via Twitter from Natasha Jones on August 14, 2019.
which means the number of 2YC faculty or students engaged with the organization is unknown. Without hypothesizing about STC’s membership, which is a mix of faculty, students, and practitioners alike, it is telling that both ATTW and CPTSC report the same relatively low percentage of 2YC faculty members.

Though efforts—no doubt thoughtful and well-informed—have been made to engage with 2YC faculty in the past, we posit that professional organizations like CPTSC, that are primarily comprised of graduate students and faculty from four-year institutions, would do well to continue those efforts to recruit and include their counterparts at 2YCs to grow membership and to increase the likelihood for collaborative research across all Carnegie institution types. We call for these national organizations to continue to cast wide nets and strive to become even more inclusive of 2YC TPC faculty and their attendant programmatic and curricular contributions and concerns.

Continuing the previous work and building on efforts to recruit 2YC TPC faculty as members and leaders in national organizations, though, is tricky. Building on prior efforts, more concrete strategies need to be in place to encourage 2YC TPC faculty (and students) to participate, join, and lead in national organizations. Feminist rhetoricians Sonja K. Foss and Cindy L. Griffin (1995) offer the concept of invitational rhetoric—one that is “built on the principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination rather than on the attempt to control others through persuasive strategies designed to effect change” (pp. 4-5). We suggest national organizations consider invitational rhetoric as a framework as they continue their recruitment efforts and strategies with the goal of more fully including 2YC faculty. For example, to encourage 2YC faculty to join CPTSC, leaders might amplify their efforts to offer specific conference sessions devoted to TPC at 2YCs, ask 2YC faculty members to consider leadership positions, invite 2YC TPC faculty to serve on the Programmatic Perspectives editorial board, or reserve executive committee roles for 2YC faculty. Overall, a field-wide goal might be to provide opportunities for 2YC faculty to professionally identify with TPC and make space for 2YC TPC faculty to contribute to national TPC organizations in ways that honor Foss and Griffin’s invitational rhetoric through a collaborative and coalitional approach.

---

14 Information was provided via email from Erin Gallalee on April 16, 2019.
Suggestions for Learning More About Two-Year College Technical and Professional Communication

Updating and locating TPC programmatic and curricular knowledge at 2YCs has revealed that TPC is alive and well at 2YCs. We have stated our main findings with the hopes that they might serve as “a means to create a relationship rooted in equality, immanent value, and self-determination” between 2YCs and four-year institutions (Foss & Griffin, 1995, p. 5). Specifically, we think the following steps can help programmatic knowledge and research at 2YCs keep a similar pace with TPC at four-year institutions, preventing an imbalance and paucity of information about TPC programs and curricula, field-wide. We suggest

• encouraging faculty and graduate students to set and lead curricular and programmatic research agendas focused on TPC at 2YCs,
• continuing efforts to involve 2YC faculty in national TPC organizations, conferences, journals, and committees,
• building additional collaborations between 2YC and four-year institution faculty and students, and
• combining resources through collaborative programs that use 2YC and four-year institution faculty to train graduate students to teach TPC in 2YC environments.

Future Research Directions

Though our study was fairly wide-ranging in its attempts to collect programmatic data to serve as a baseline for future studies, we did not engage in much cross institutional analysis or discuss the faculty or student experience. We suggest that future studies might engage in a granular comparison between the various course offerings between 2YCs, particularly in terms of what courses are required within or across regions. Future studies might also investigate transferring TPC credits from 2YCs to four-year institutions and the development of articulation agreements to build bridges between institutions and even specific programs and departments, which would enhance students’ learning experiences. Other future studies might examine pedagogical approaches, programmatic student learning outcomes, and relationships with industry. Research questions might include:

• How does the service course function at 2YCs? What academic departments use the service course?
• How are graduate students and faculty trained to teach TPC at 2YCs? What faculty development opportunities are available
for those who teach TPC at 2YCs?

- How is student success and learning measured in TPC courses at 2YCs? How are these measurements influenced by state legislatures and federal mandates?

In short, we invite researchers to use our study as a starting place to further investigate the role TPC plays in both faculty teaching and student learning experiences at 2YCs.
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Appendix A

Alabama
Bevill State Community College
Bishop State Community College
Calhoun Community College
Central Alabama Community College
Chattahoochee Valley Community College
Coastal Alabama Community College
Concordia College Alabama
Enterprise State Community College
Gadsden State Community College
Herzing University-Birmingham
Huntsville Bible College
J. F. Drake State Community and Technical College
J. F. Ingram State Technical College
Jefferson State Community College
Lawson State Community College
Lurleen B. Wallace Community College
Northeast Alabama Community College
Northwest Shoals Community College
Reid State Technical College
Remington College-Mobile Campus
Shelton State Community College
Snead State Community College
Southern Union State Community College
Trenholm State Technical College
Wallace Community College
Wallace Community College Selma
Wallace State Community College

Alaska
Alaska Christian College
Kodiak College
Kenai Peninsula College
Matanuska–Susitna College
Prince William Sound Community College

Arizona
Arizona Western College
Central Arizona College
Chandler-Gilbert Community College
College America-Flagstaff
College America-Phoenix
Cochise College
Coconino Community College
Eastern Arizona College
Estrella Mountain Community College
GateWay Community College
Glendale Community College
Mesa Community College
Mohave Community College
Northland Pioneer College
Paradise Valley Community College
Phoenix College
Pima Community College
Rio Salado College
Scottsdale Community College
South Mountain Community College
Yavapai College

Arkansas
Arkansas Baptist College
Arkansas Northeastern College
Arkansas State University Beebe
Arkansas State University Mid-South
Arkansas State University Mountain Home
Arkansas State University Newport
Baptist Health College Little Rock
Black River Technical College
College of the Ouachitas
East Arkansas Community College
Jefferson Regional Medical Center School of Nursing
National Park College
North Arkansas College
North West Arkansas Community College
Ozarka College
Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas
Remington College-Little Rock Campus
Shorter College
South Arkansas Community College
Southeast Arkansas College
Southern Arkansas University Tech
University of Arkansas Community College College at Batesville
University of Arkansas Community College at Hope/Texarkana
Locating Technical and Professional Communication

University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton
University of Arkansas Cossatot
University of Arkansas Pulaski Technical College
University of Arkansas Rich Mountain

California
Allan Hancock College
American Academy of Dramatic Arts-Los Angeles
American River College
Antelope Valley College
Bakersfield College
Barstow Community College
Berkeley City College
Butte College
Cabrillo College
California College San Diego
Cañada College
Casa Loma College-Van Nuys
CBD College
Cerritos College
Cerro Coso Community College
Chabot College
Chaffey College
Citrus College
City College of San Francisco
Clovis Community College
Coastline Community College
College of Alameda
College of Marin
College of San Mateo
College of the Canyons
College of the Desert
College of the Redwoods
College of the Sequoias
College of the Siskiyous
Columbia College
Community Christian College
Compton College
Contra Costa College
Copper Mountain College
Cosumnes River College
Crafton Hills College
Cuesta College
Cuyamaca College
Cypress College
Deanza College
Diablo Valley College
East Los Angeles College
El Camino College
Epic Bible College
Evergreen Valley College
Feather River College
Folsom Lake College
Foothill College
Fresno City College
Fullerton College
Gavilan College
Glendale Community College
Golden West College
Grossmont College
Hartnell College
Homestead Schools
Imperial Valley College
Irvine Valley College
Lake Tahoe Community College
Laney College
Las Positas College
Lassen College
Long Beach City College
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Harbor College
Los Angeles Mission College
Los Angeles Ort College-Los Angeles Campus
Los Angeles Ort College-Van Nuys Campus
Los Angeles Pierce College
Los Angeles Southwest College
Los Angeles Trade-Tech College
Los Angeles Valley College
Los Medanos College
Mendocino College
Merced College
Merritt College
Miracosta College
Mission College
Modesto Junior College
Monterey Peninsula College
Moorpark College
Moreno Valley College
Mt. San Antonio College
Mt. San Jacinto College
Napa Valley College
Norco College
Ohlone College
Orange Coast College
Oxnard College
Palo Verde College
Palomar College
Pasadena City College
Porterville College
Reedley College
Rio Hondo College
Riverside City College
Sacramento City College
Saddleback College
San Bernardino Valley College
San Diego City College
San Diego Mesa College
San Diego Miramar College
San Joaquin Delta College
San Jose City College
Santa Ana College
Santa Barbara City College
Santa Monica College
Santa Rosa Junior College
Santiago Canyon College
Shasta College
Sierra College
Skyline College
Solano Community College
Southwestern College
Taft College
University of the People
Ventura College
West Hills College Coalinga
West Hills College Lemoore
West Los Angeles College
West Valley College
Victor Valley College
Woodland Community College
Yuba College

**Colorado**
Altierus Career College-Colorado Springs
Altierus Career College-Thornton
Arapahoe Community College
Community College of Aurora
Community College of Denver
College America-Colorado Springs
College America-Denver
College America-Fort Collins
Colorado Northwestern Community College
Front Range Community College
Johnson and Wales University-Denver
Lamar Community College
Morgan Community College
Northeastern Junior College
Otero Community College
Pikes Peak Community College
Pueblo Community College
Red Rocks Community College
Trinidad State Junior College

**Connecticut**
Asnuntuck Community College
Capital Community College
Gateway Community College
Goodwin College
Housatonic Community College
Manchester Community College
Middlesex Community College
Naugatuck Valley Community College
Northwestern Connecticut Community College
Norwalk Community College
Quinebaug Valley Community College
Three Rivers Community College
Tunxis Community College
St. Vincent’s College
Delaware
Delaware College of Art and Design
Delaware Technical Community College
Margaret H. Rollins School of Nursing at Beebe Medical Center

Florida
Academy for Nursing and Health Occupations
Altierus Career College-Orange Park
Altierus Career College-Tampa
Broward College
Chipola College
City College-Altamonte Springs
City College-Fort Lauderdale
City College-Gainesville
City College-Hollywood
City College-Miami
College of Central Florida
Daytona State College
Eastern Florida State College
Everest University-South Orlando
Florida College
Florida Gateway College
Florida Keys Community College
Florida School of Traditional Midwifery
Florida State College at Jacksonville
Florida Southwest State College
Gulf Coast State College
Herzing University-Winter Park
Hillsborough Community College
Indian River State College
Keiser University-Fort Lauderdale
Lake-Sumter State College
Miami Dade College
North Florida Community College
Northwest Florida State College
Palm Beach State College
Pasco-Hernando Community College
Pensacola State College
Polk State College
Saber College
Santa Fe College
Seminole State College of Florida
South Florida Bible College and Theological Seminary
South Florida State College
St. Petersburg College
State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota
St. Johns River State College
Sunstate Academy-Jones Technical Institute
Tallahassee Community College
Ultimate Medical Academy-Clearwater
University of Fort Lauderdale
Valencia College
Wyotech-Daytona

Georgia
Albany Technical College
Altierus Career College-Norcross
Andrew College
Athens Technical College
Atlanta Technical College
Augusta Technical College
Carver Bible College
Central Georgia Technical College
Chattahoochee Technical College
Coastal Pines Technical College
Columbus Technical College
Emory University-Oxford College
Georgia Northwestern Technical College
Georgia Piedmont Technical College
Gupton Jones College of Funeral Service
Gwinnett Technical College
Helms College
Lanier Technical College
North Georgia Technical College
Oconee Fall Line Technical College
Ogeechee Technical College
Savannah Technical College
South Georgia Technical College
Southeastern Technical College
Southern Crescent Technical College
Southern Regional Technical College
West Georgia Technical College
Wiregrass Georgia Technical College
Hawai‘i
Hawai‘i Community College
Honolulu Community College
Kapi‘olani Community College
Kaua‘i Community College
Leeward Community College
Remington College-Honolulu Campus
University of Hawai‘i Maui College
Windward Community College

Idaho
College of Eastern Idaho
College of Southern Idaho
College of Western Idaho
North Idaho College
Stevens-Henager College-Idaho Falls
Stevens-Henager College-Twin Falls

Illinois
Black Hawk College
Blessing Hospital School of Radiologic Technology
Carl Sandburg College
Christian Life College
College of DuPage
College of Lake County
Danville Area Community College
East St. Louis Community College
Elgin Community College
Frontier Community College
Graham Hospital School of Nursing
Harold Washington College
Harper College
Harry S. Truman College
Heartland Community College
Highland Community College
Illinois Valley Community College
Illinois Central College
John A. Logan College
John Wood Community College
Joliet Junior College
Kankakee Community College
Kaskaskia College
Kennedy-King College
Kishwaukee College
Lake Land College
Lewis and Clark Community College
Lincoln College
Lincoln Land Community College
Lincoln Trail College
MacCormac College
Malcolm X College
McHenry County College
Moraine Valley Community College
Morrison Institute of Technology
Morton College
Northwest Suburban College
Oakton Community College
Olive-Harvey College
Olney Central College
Parkland College
Prairie State College
Rend Lake College
Richard J. Daley College
Richland Community College
Rock Valley College
Saint Augustine College
Sauk Valley Community College
Shawnee Community College
South Suburban College
Southeastern Illinois College
Southwestern Illinois College
Spoon River College
Triton College
Wabash Valley College
Waubonsee Community College
Wilbur Wright College

Indiana
Anabaptist Mennonite Biblical Seminary
Ancilla College
The Art Institute of Indianapolis
College of Court Reporting
Earlham College
Harrison College
International Business Catalog
Ivy Tech Community Colleges of Indiana
Mid-America College of Funeral Service
Saint Elizabeth School of Nursing
Vincennes University

Iowa
Des Moines Area Community College
Eastern Iowa Community College
Emmaus Bible College
Hawkeye Community College
Indian Hills Community College
Iowa Central Community College
Iowa Lakes Community College
Iowa Valley Community College
Iowa Western Community College
Kirkwood Community College
Mercy-St. Luke's School of Radiologic Technology
Northeast Iowa Community College
North Iowa Area Community College
Northwest Iowa Community College
Southeastern Community College
Southwestern Community College
St. Luke's College
Unity Point Health-Des Moines School of Radiologic Technology
Western Iowa Tech Community College

Kansas
Allen County Community College
Barton County Community College
Butler Community College
Cloud County Community College
Coffeyville Community College
Colby Community College
Cowley County Community College
Dodge City Community College
Donnelly College
Flint Hills Technical College
Fort Scott Community College
Garden City Community College
Hesston College
Highland Community College
Hutchinson Community College
Independence Community College
Johnson County Community College
Kansas Christian College
Kansas City Kansas Community College
Labette Community College
Manhattan Area Technical College
Neosho County Community College
North Central Kansas Technical College
Northwest Kansas Technical College
Pratt Community College
Salina Area Technical College
Seward County Community College/Area Technical School
Washburn Institute of Technology
Wichita Area Technical College

Kentucky
Ashland Community and Technical College
Big Sandy Community and Technical College
Bluegrass Community and Technical College
Elizabethtown Community and Technical College
Gateway Community and Technical College
Hazard Community and Technical College
Henderson Community College
Hopkinsville Community College
Jefferson Community and Technical College
Madisonville Community College
Maysville Community and Technical College
Owensboro Community and Technical College
Simmons College of Kentucky
Somerset Community College
Southcentral Kentucky Community and Technical College
Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College
West Kentucky Community and Technical College

Louisiana
Academy of Interactive Entertainment
Baton Rouge Community College
Baton Rouge General Medical Center-School of Nursing
Bossier Parish Community College
Central Louisiana Technical and Community College
Delgado Community College
Fletcher Technical and Community College
Herzing University-Kenner
Louisiana Delta Community College
Northshore Technical and Community College
Northwest Louisiana Technical College
Nunez Community College
Remington College-Baton Rouge Campus
Remington College-Lafayette Campus
Remington College-Shreveport Campus
River Parishes Community College
South Louisiana Community College
SOWELA Technical and Community College

Maine
Central Maine Community College
Eastern Maine Community College
Kennebec Valley Community College
The Landing School
Maine College of Health Professions
Northern Maine Community College
Southern Maine Community College
Washington County Community College
York County Community College

Maryland
Allegany College of Maryland
Anne Arundel Community College
Baltimore City Community College
Carroll Community College
Community College of Baltimore County
Cecil College
Chesapeake College
College of Southern Maryland
Frederick Community College
Garrett College
Hagerstown Community College
Harford Community College
Howard Community College
Montgomery College
Prince George's Community College
Wor-Wic Community College
Massachusetts
Bard College - Holyoke Microcollege
Bard College at Simon's Rock
Berkshire Community College
Bristol Community College
Bunker Hill Community College
Cape Cod Community College
Dean College
Greenfield Community College
Holyoke Community College
Laboure College
Lawrence Memorial Hospital School of Nursing
Massachusetts Bay Community College
Massasoit Community College
Middlesex Community College
Mount Wachusett Community College
North Bennet Street School
Northern Essex Community College
North Shore Community College
Quinsigamond Community College
Roxbury Community College
Signature Healthcare Brockton Hospital School of Nursing
Springfield Technical Community College
Urban College of Boston

Michigan
Alpena Community College
Baker College
Bay College
Bay Mills Community College
Delta College
Ferris State University
Glen Oaks Community College
Gogebic Community College
Grace Christian University
Grand Rapids Community College
Henry Ford College
Jackson College
Kalamazoo Valley Community College
Kellogg Community College
Kirtland Community College
Lake Michigan College
Lake Superior State University
Lansing Community College
Macomb Community College
Michigan Barber School Inc
Mid Michigan Community College
Monroe County Community College
Montcalm Community College
Mott Community College
Muskegon Community College
North Central Michigan College
Northern Michigan University
Northwestern Michigan College
Oakland Community College
Schoolcraft College
School of Missionary Aviation Technology
Southwestern Michigan College
St. Clair County Community College
Washtenaw Community College
Wayne County Community College
West Shore Community College

**Minnesota**
Alexandria Technical and Community College
Anoka-Ramsey Community College
Anoka Technical College
Bethany Global University
Central Lakes College
Century College
Dakota County Technical College
Dunwoody College of Technology
Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College
Hennepin Technical College
Herzing University-Minneapolis
Hibbing Community College
Inver Hills Community College
Itasca Community College
Lake Superior College
Mesabi Range Community and Technical College
Minneapolis Community and Technical College
Minnesota West Community and Technical College
Minnesota State College – Southeast Technical
Minnesota State Community and Technical College
Normandale Community College
North Hennepin Community College
Northland Community and Technical College
Northwest Technical College
Pine Technical and Community College
Rainy River Community College
Ridgewater College
Riverland Community College
Rochester Community and Technical College
Saint Paul College
South Central College
St. Cloud Technical and Community College
Vermilion Community College
White Earth Tribal and Community College

**Mississippi**
Coahoma Community College
Copiah-Lincoln Community College
East Central Community College
East Mississippi Community College
Hinds Community College
Holmes Community College
Itawamba Community College
Jones County Junior College
Meridian Community College
Mississippi Delta Community College
Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College
Northeast Mississippi Community College
Northwest Mississippi Community College
Pearl River Community College
Southeastern Baptist College
Southwest Mississippi Community College

**Missouri**
Bolivar Technical College
Cottey College
Crowder College
East Central College
Jefferson College
Metropolitan Community College
Mineral Area College
Missouri State University–West Plains
Moberly Area Community College
North Central Missouri College
Ozarks Technical Community College
Ranken Technical College
Southeast Missouri Hospital College of Nursing and Health Sciences
State Fair Community College
State Technical College of Missouri
St. Charles Community College
St. Louis Community College
Texas County Technical College
Three Rivers College

Montana
Aaniiih Nakoda College
Blackfeet Community College
Chief Dull Knife College
City College at Montana State University Billings
Dawson Community College
Flathead Valley Community College
Fort Peck Community College
Gallatin College Montana State University
Great Falls College Montana State University
Little Big Horn College
Miles Community College
Montana Bible College
Salish Kootenai College
Stone Child College

Nebraska
Central Community College
CHI Health School of Radiologic Technology
Little Priest Tribal College
Metropolitan Community College
Mid-Plains Community College
Nebraska Indian Community College
Northeast Community College
Omaha School of Massage and Healthcare of Herzing University
Southeast Community College
Western Nebraska Community College

Nevada
Altierus Career College-Henderson
College of Southern Nevada
Truckee Meadows Community College
Western Nevada College

**New Hampshire**
Great Bay Community College
Lakes Region Community College
Manchester Community College
New Hampshire Technical Institute
Nashua Community College
River Valley Community College
St. Joseph School of Nursing
White Mountains Community College

**New Jersey**
Associated Beth Rivkah Schools
Assumption College for Sisters
Atlantic Cape Community College
Bais Binyomin Academy
Bergen Community College
Brookdale Community College
Camden County College
County College of Morris
Cumberland County College
Essex County College
Hackensack Meridian Health JFK Medical Center-School of Imaging
Hackensack Meridian Health JFK Medical Center-School of Nursing
Holy Name Medical Center-Sister Claire Tynan School of Nursing
Hudson County Community College
Mercer County Community College
Middlesex County College
Ocean County College
Passaic County Community College
Raritan Valley Community College
Rowan College at Burlington County
Rowan College at Gloucester County
St. Francis Medical Center School of Nursing
St. Francis Medical Center-School of Radiologic Technology
Salem Community College
Sussex County Community College
Union County College
Warren County Community College
New Mexico
Central New Mexico Community College
Clovis Community College
Eastern New Mexico University – Roswell
Eastern New Mexico University – Ruidoso
Luna Community College
Mesalands Community College
New Mexico Junior College
New Mexico State University – Alamogordo
New Mexico State University – Carlsbad
New Mexico State University – Dona Ana
New Mexico State University – Grants
San Juan College
Santa Fe Community College
University of New Mexico – Gallup
University of New Mexico – Los Alamos
University of New Mexico – Taos
University of New Mexico – Valencia

New York
Adirondack Community College
The Aliley School
American Academy McAllister Institute of Funeral Service
American Academy of Dramatic Arts-New York
American Musical and Dramatic Academy
Arnot Ogden Medical Center
Belanger School of Nursing
Beth Hatalmud Rabbinical College
Beth Medrash Meor Yitzchok
Borough of Manhattan Community College
Bronx Community College
Broome Community College
Cayuga County Community College
Center for Allied Health Education
Circle in the Square Theatre School
Clinton Community College
Cochran School of Nursing
Columbia-Greene Community College
Corning Community College
Culinary Institute of America-Hyde Park
CVPH Medical Center School of Radiologic Technology
Dutchess Community College
Seminar L’moros Bais Yaakov
St. Joseph’s College of Nursing
Suffolk County Community College
Sullivan County Community College
Talmudical Institute of Upstate New York
Talmudical Seminary Oholei Torah
Tompkins Cortland Community College
Trocaire College
Ulster County Community College
Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology
Villa Maria College
Westchester Community College
Word of Life Bible Institute
Yeshiva Gedolah Kesser Torah
Yeshiva of the Telshe Alumni
Yeshiva Ohr Naftoli
Yeshiva Sholom Shachna
Yeshivas Novominsk
Yeshivath Zichron Moshe

North Carolina
Alamance Community College
Asheville–Buncombe Technical and Community College
Beaufort County Community College
Bladen Community College
Blue Ridge Community College
Brunswick Community College
Cabarrus College of Health Sciences
Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute
Cape Fear Community College
Carolina College of Biblical Studies
Carteret Community College
Catawba Valley Community College
Central Carolina Community College
Central Piedmont Community College
Cleveland Community College
Coastal Carolina Community College
College of The Albemarle
Craven Community College
Davidson County Community College
Durham Technical Community College
Edgecombe Community College
Locating Technical and Professional Communication

Fayetteville Technical and Community College
Forsyth Technical and Community College
Gaston College
Grace College of Divinity
Guilford Technical and Community College
Halifax Community College
Haywood Community College
Isothermal Community College
James Sprunt Community College
Johnson & Wales University-Charlotte
Johnston Community College
Lenoir Community College
Louisburg College
Martin Community College
Mayland Community College
McDowell Technical Community College
Mitchell Community College
Montgomery Community College
Nash Community College
Pamlico Community College
Piedmont Community College
Pitt Community College
Randolph Community College
Richmond Community College
Roanoke-Chowan Community College
Robeson Community College
Rockingham Community College
Rowan-Cabarrus Community College
Sampson Community College
Sandhills Community College
Southeastern Community College
South Piedmont Community College
Southwestern Community College
Stanly Community College
Surry Community College
Tri-County Community College
Vance-Granville Community College
Wake Technical Community College
Watts School of Nursing
Wayne Community College
Western Piedmont Community College
Wilkes Community College
Wilson Community College

North Dakota
Bismarck State College
Dakota College at Bottineau
Lake Region State College
North Dakota State College of Science
Turtle Mountain Community College
United Tribes Technical College
Williston State College

Ohio
Altierus Career College-Columbus
Aultman College of Nursing and Health Sciences
Belmont College
Central Ohio Technical College
Chatfield College
Cincinnati College of Mortuary Science
Cincinnati State Technical and Community College
Clark State Community College
Cleveland Clinic Health System-School of Diagnostic Imaging
Columbus State Community College
Cuyahoga Community College
Eastern Gateway Community College
Edison State Community College
Firelands Regional Medical Center School of Nursing
Good Samaritan College of Nursing and Health Science
Herzing University-Akron
Herzing University-Toledo
Hocking College
Lakeland Community College
Lorain County Community College
Marion Technical College
Mercy College of Ohio
North Central State
Northwest State Community College
Owens Community College
Remington College-Cleveland Campus
Rhodes State College
Rio Grande Community College
Rosedale Bible College
Sinclair Community College
Southern State Community College
Stark State College
Terra State Community College
The Christ College of Nursing and Health Sciences
Trinity Health System School of Nursing
Tri-State Bible College
University of Northwestern Ohio
University of Rio Grande
Valor Christian College
Washington State Community College
Zane State College

**Oklahoma**
Carl Albert State
Community Care College
Connors State
Eastern Oklahoma State
Murray State
Northeastern OK A&M
Northern Oklahoma
Oklahoma City Community College
Redlands Community College
Rose State College
Seminole State College
Tulsa Community College
Western Oklahoma State

**Oregon**
Blue Mountain Community College
Central Oregon Community College
Chemeketa Community College
Clackamas Community College
Clatsop Community College
Columbia Gorge Community College
Klamath Community College
Lane Community College
Linn-Benton Community College
Mt. Hood Community College
Oregon Coast Community College
Pacific Bible College
Portland Actors Conservatory
Portland Community College
Rogue Community College
Southwestern Oregon Community College
Tillamook Bay Community College
Treasure Valley Community College
Umpqua Community College

**Pennsylvania**
Aria Health School of Nursing
Bidwell Training Center Inc.
Bucks County Community College
Butler County Community College
Community College of Allegheny County
Community College of Beaver County
Community College of Philadelphia
Citizens School of Nursing
Commonwealth Technical Institute
Delaware County Community College
Geisinger-Lewistown Hospital School of Nursing
Harcum College
Harrisburg Area Community College
Jameson Health System
Johnson College
Joseph F. McCloskey School of Nursing at Schuylkill Health
Lackawanna College
Lehigh Carbon Community College
Luzerne County Community College
Manor College
Mercy Hospital School of Nursing
Mercyhurst University-North East Campus
Montgomery County Community College
Northampton Community College
Orleans Technical College
Pennsylvania College of Health Sciences
Pennsylvania Highlands Community College
Pennsylvania Institute of Technology
Pittsburgh Institute of Aeronautics
Pittsburgh Institute of Mortuary Science Inc
Pittsburgh Technical College
Reading Area Community College
Reading Hospital School of Health Sciences
Rosedale Technical College
St. Margaret School of Nursing
Studio Incamminati
Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center-Shadyside School of Nursing
Valley Forge Military College
Washington Hospital School of Nursing
Washington Hospital School of Radiologic Technology
Western Pennsylvania Hospital School of Nursing
Westmoreland County Community College
The Workforce Institute’s City College
Wyotech-Blairsville

**Rhode Island**
Community College of Rhode Island
IYRS School of Technology and Trades
New England Institute of Technology

**South Carolina**
Aiken Technical College
Central Carolina Technical College
Clinton College
Denmark Technical College
Florence-Darlington Technical College
Greenville Technical College
Horry-Georgetown Technical College
Midlands Technical College
Northeastern Technical College
Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College
Piedmont Technical College
Spartanburg Community College
Spartanburg Methodist College
Technical College of the Lowcountry
Tri-County Technical College
Trident Technical College
W.L. Bonner College
Williamsburg Technical College
York Technical College

**South Dakota**
Avera McKennan Hospital School of Radiologic Technology
Avera Sacred Heart Hospital
Black Hills State University
Dakota State University
Lake Area Technical Institute
Mitchell Technical Institute
Northern State University
Sanford Medical Center
Sinte Gleska University
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology
South Dakota State University
Southeast Technical Institute
Western Dakota Technical Institute

**Tennessee**
Chattanooga State Community College
Cleveland State Community College
Columbia State Community College
Dyersburg State Community College
Jackson State Community College
John A. Gupton College
Motlow State Community College
Nashville State Community College
Northeast State Community College
Pellissippi State Community College
Remington College-Memphis Campus
Remington College-Nashville Campus
Roane State Community College
Southwest Tennessee Community College
Volunteer State Community College
Walters State Community College
William Moore College of Technology

**Texas**
Altierus Career College-Arlington
Altierus Career College-Bissonnet
Altierus Career College-Fort Worth South
Alvin Community College
Amarillo College
Angelina College
Austin Community College
Blinn College
Brazosport College
Central Texas College
Cisco College
Clarendon College
Coastal Bend College  
College of the Mainland  
Collin County Community College  
Commonwealth Institute of Funeral Service  
Covenant School of Nursing And Allied Health  
Culinary Institute of America, San Antonio  
Dallas County Community College-Brookhaven College  
Dallas County Community College-Cedar Valley College  
Dallas County Community College-Eastfield College  
Dallas County Community College-El Centro College  
Dallas County Community College-Mountain View College  
Dallas County Community College-North Lake College  
Dallas County Community College-Richland  
Dallas Institute of Funeral Service  
Dallas Nursing Institute  
Del Mar College  
El Paso Community College  
Frank Phillips College  
Galveston College  
Grayson College  
Hallmark University  
Hill College  
Houston Community Colleges  
Howard College  
Jacksonville College-Main Campus  
Kilgore College  
Laredo Community College  
Lee College  
Lone Star College System  
McLennan Community College  
Midland College  
Navarro College  
North Central Texas College  
Northeast Lakeview College  
Northeast Texas Community College  
Northwest Vista College  
Odessa College  
Palo Alto College  
Panola College  
Paris Junior College  
Ranger College  
Remington College-Dallas Campus
Remington College-Fort Worth Campus
Remington College-Houston Southeast Campus
Remington College-North Houston Campus
San Antonio College
San Jacinto College
South Plains College
South Texas College
Southwestern Christian College
Southwest Texas Junior College
St. Philip's College
Tarrant Community College
Temple College
Texarkana College
Texas Southmost College
Trinity Valley Community College
Tyler Junior College
Vernon College
Victoria College
Weatherford College
Western Texas College
Wharton County Junior College

Utah
Independence University
LDS Business College
Salt Lake Community College
Snow College
Stevens-Henager College--Logan
Stevens-Henager College--St. George
Stevens-Henager College--West Haven

Vermont
Community College of Vermont
Landmark College

Virginia
Altierus Career College-Chesapeake
Blue Ridge Community College
Bon Secours St Mary's Hospital School of Medical Imaging
Central College of Nursing
Central Virginia Community College
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College
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Danville Community College
Eastern Shore Community College
Germanna Community College
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
John Tyler Community College
Life Pacific College-Ignite
Lord Fairfax Community College
Mountain Empire Community College
New River Community College
Northern Virginia Community College
Patrick Henry Community College
Paul D. Camp Community College
Piedmont Virginia Community College
Rappahannock Community College
Riverside College of Health Careers
Southside Virginia Community College
Southwest Virginia Community College
Thomas Nelson Community College
Tidewater Community College
Virginia Highlands Community College
Virginia University of Lynchburg
Virginia Western Community College
Wave Leadership College
Wytheville Community College

Washington
Academy of Interactive Entertainment
Altierus Career College Everett
Altierus Career College-Tacoma
Bates Technical College
Bellingham Technical College
Bellvue College
Big Bend Community College
Cascadia College
Centralia College
Clark College
Clover Park Technical College
Columbia Basin College
Edmonds Community College
Everett Community College
Grays Harbor College
Green River College
Highline College
Lake Washington Institute of Technology
Lower Columbia College
Montessori Education Institute of the Pacific Northwest
North Seattle College
Northwest School of Wooden Boat Building
Olympic College
Peninsula College
Perry Technical Institute
Pierce College
Renton Technical College
Seattle Vocational Institute
Shoreline Community College
Skagit Valley College
South Puget Sound Community College
South Seattle College
Spokane Community College
Spokane Falls Community College
Tacoma Community College
Walla Walla Community College
Wenatchee Valley College
Whatcom Community College
Yakima Valley College

Washington DC
National Conservatory of Drama
University of the District of Columbia Community College

West Virginia
Blue Ridge Community and Technical College
Bridgevalley Community and Technical College
Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College
Mountwest Community and Technical College
New River Community and Technical College
Parkersburg West Virginia University
Pierpont Community and Technical College
Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College
West Virginia Northern Community College

Wisconsin
Blackhawk Technical College
Chippewa Valley Technical College
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College of Menominee Nation
Fox Valley Technical College
Gateway Technical College
Herzing University-Madison
Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College
Lakeshore Technical College
Madison Area Technical College
Mid-State Technical College
Milwaukee Area Technical College
Moraine Park Technical College
Nicolet Area Technical College
Northcentral Technical College
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College
Shepherds College
Southwest Wisconsin Technical College
University of Wisconsin Colleges
Waukesha County Technical College
Western Technical College
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College

Wyoming
Casper College
Central Wyoming College
Eastern Wyoming College
Laramie County Community College
Northwest College
Sheridan College
Western Wyoming Community College
WyoTech
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Abstract. As part of a CPTSC-funded and IRB-approved longitudinal study, this article presents findings from interviews with TPW instructors at 10 different Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) across the US. Through interviews developed with a testimonio methodology, the researchers seek to understand the various approaches, affordances, and challenges that TPW programs at HSIs navigate when developing responsive programs for Latinx students. Through thematic coding, the researchers identified the following themes from interview data: 1) there is very little explicit, intentional programmatic attention to HSI designation in design and curriculum, 2) there are smaller scale best practices enacted by individual faculty, and 3) there are demonstrated regional differences and affordances based on the campus locale. Based on these findings, the researchers recommend that TPW program administrators continue developing and implementing localized research frameworks and methodologies that appeal specifically to Latinx communities, in order to enact participatory practices to localize TPW curricula. Further, the researchers recommend coalition-building between TPW faculty at HSIs and those teaching at non-HSIs, as these networks and coalitions may bring visibility to the value and importance of Latinx students in TPW. As the field of TPW continues expanding and practicing its commitment to inclusion and justice, structural changes are needed at both local institutional and field-wide levels to support Latinx students.
Increasing the representation and sustainability of linguistically and ethnically diverse students and faculty in Technical and Professional Writing (TPW) programs at Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) has been a goal of social-justice driven scholars in TPW for over 16 years. For example, at the first meeting of the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication’s Diversity Committee in 2004, Diversity Committee members identified recruiting and sustaining students from Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other MSIs as a primary goal for the field of TPW (Jones, Savage, Yu, 2014, p. 135). Since then, social-justice driven scholars continue to work to increase representation and sustainability for minoritized students in the field, and at the same time continue to call out the many structural challenges that students and faculty face when working toward justice and inclusion in TPW (Haas, 2012; Haas and Eble, 2018; Jones, 2016; Williams and Pimentel, 2016). As Miriam F. Williams (2016) explains in her introduction to *Communicating Race, Ethnicity, and Identity in Technical Communication*, the field of TPW “still, and unfortunately…lag[s] behind our colleagues in other areas of English studies (literature, rhetoric and composition, and creative writing), in finding ways to wrestle with two core elements of American identity—race and ethnicity,” despite the fact that race and ethnicity influence all aspects of communication in technical environments (p. 1).

As a field that historically focused on efficiency and simplicity in communication (Jones, 2016), TPW has a long way to go to adequately support students’ diverse communicative practices, cultural and racial experiences and expertise, and embodied histories. As Jones and Williams explain (2020), “while America perceives itself to be a nation of imaginative thinkers, often the imagining of Black folks is not productively acknowledged, properly amplified, or respectfully appreciated” (n. pag). We argue that this applies to students at MSIs, whose expertise and interests are often overshadowed by programmatic and field-wide infrastructures that position white/Western/standard English-dominant communication practices as neutral determinants of accuracy while deeming non-standardized forms of technical communication subpar and erroneous (Gubala, Larson, and Melonçon, 2020). Thus, as we demonstrate in this article, making TPW programs localized and responsive to minoritized students (e.g., Latinx students), requires structural changes in how TPW is defined and implemented.

**Keywords:** Hispanic-serving institutions, inclusion, Latinx students, longitudinal study, structural change
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at program and University-wide levels and demands multiple levels of infrastructural support and coalition-building (Jones, 2020). Extending ongoing work in TPW that seeks to increase representation and sustainability for students from MSIs, this article details conversations with faculty at Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) across the US, noting emerging themes in how these faculty navigate disciplinary and institutional issues when seeking to develop TPW programs localized specifically for Latinx students.

As three faculty members with varied experiences working in, attending, and developing TPW programs at Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), we are interested in understanding the complexities and possibilities that the field of TPW can present for Latinx students, institutions, and communities. We understand that institutions designated as HSIs come with specific responsibilities toward working with and serving Latinx students, as well as the surrounding communities in which our students live and work. We suggest that paying closer attention to if, and how, TPW programs are being localized for Latinx communities can provide productive avenues for TPW’s continual work to embrace and extend models that highlight our field’s commitment to social justice and inclusivity. Developing programs, curricula, and institutional commitments to Latinx students at HSIs can and should be embedded into TPW’s social justice agenda, particularly as the demographics in TPW programs and classes increasingly include more minoritized students, and specifically those from Latinx communities. As Enriquez-Loya and Leon (2017) explain, “Chicanx/Latinx students have been in our university campuses for a long time,” and it is our responsibility as TPW teachers, administrators, and practitioners invested in practices like localization, social justice, and intercultural communication to develop programs and pedagogies that centralize the experiences and expertise of our Latinx students (p. 212).

It’s also important to acknowledge that the term “Latinx” encompasses wide ranging communities with different racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. As Krystle Danuz (2016) explains in her discussion of Spanglish in technical communication, “The Hispanic population ‘represents a high degree of within-group variations’ being those of Hispanic people descending from Spanish-speaking areas all over the world (Kim et al., 2009, p. 91)” (p. 121). In this article, we use the term “Latinx” instead of Hispanic or Latina/o to describe “an intersectional identity term meant to be used by gender fluid and gender nonconforming people, LGBTQIA persons, cisgender men and women, and those taking a political stance that ethnicity and gender exist on a spectrum and are not dichotomous” (García, 2017, p. 210). Thus, we use
the term “Latinx” to describe people of Latin American ethnic identity, while at the same time recognizing that Latinx people are diverse in terms of race, gender, class, ability, and other identifications. While Latinx is not an all-encompassing term that describes a homogenous group, we argue that Latinx identities and their pluralities should be centralized in all programs at Hispanic-Serving Institutions, including TPW (Medina, 2016).

In their recent article on “Informing Efforts to Increase Diversity” in technical and professional communication programs, Dayley and Walton (2018) explain that a lack of student diversity in technical and professional communication programs is a “recognized weakness” of the field (p. 5). Through their online survey exploring student motivation for studying TPW, Dayley and Walton (2018) argue that increasing student diversity in TPW programs requires programmatic shifts in both curricular design and programmatic environments in order to establish and sustain TPW programs “that are welcoming of the experiences and contributions of students from a diverse range of backgrounds” (p. 10). We argue that this is the case for Latinx students who may not have a background in TPW, and who may feel excluded from technical and scientific fields throughout their educational experiences. Increasing representation and sustainability for Latinx students in TPW programs demands we specifically attend to the backgrounds, histories, and skills of diverse student populations, as well as purposefully act to make programs both appealing and sustaining for a more diverse student demographic. As Dayley and Walton (2018) continue, “the goal is not only to bring more diverse groups of people into the field but to welcome the range of expertise, experiences, and insights from underrepresented groups in shifting and shaping the identity of the field itself” (p. 10).

We acknowledge that challenges exist for actualizing these goals, which include funding disparities and internalized and institutionalized oppression. For example, there is disparity in the money received from federal revenue sources per student at HSI, compared to the funds received for students at all degree granting institutions, despite the fact that HSIs in general educate a disproportionately low-income student population (St. Amour, 2020). Also underlying a hesitancy to centralize HSI and Latinx experiences is a fear of alienating non-Latinx students, along with racism that treats Latinx students as deficient. For example, Medina (2014) examined how “language diversity, functioning as an ethnic marker, is ignored to the detriment of Latin@ students whose bilingual linguistic abilities are dismissed when teaching and practicing ICT [information and communication technology] literacy.”
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(p. 65). Often then, the focus of program development at HSIs is remediation and vocation, when educators design curricula and programs with deficit-based frameworks and assumptions about Latinx students instead of inclusive, asset-based frameworks (Bhattacharya, Ordaz, Mosqueda, & Cooper, 2020). Building TPW programs at HSIs is a way to remedy a lack of funding, but more importantly, to centralize HSIs in our ethos to reconfigure Latinx students and the HSI designation as assets to build programs, community relationships, and curricula. Thus, in this article, we introduce a longitudinal study that we have been conducting to develop a heuristic and set of best practices for developing localized TPW programs at HSIs.

Background on HSIs

While what constitutes a Hispanic-Serving Institution is seemingly clear and understandable because it only requires meeting a student population percentage, HSIs are also one of the least understood institutional designation compared to other minority institutions. HSIs are defined in federal law (the Higher Education Opportunity Act, Title V, 2008) as accredited, degree-granting, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education with 25% or more total undergraduate Hispanic full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment. HSIs have tripled since 1990 and continue to grow exponentially. Yet, as we have noted, HSIs tend to be more underfunded than other institutions, with less money spent per student (St. Amour, 2020). Once an institution is designated an HSI, it is eligible to receive federal grant funding. Ideally, this grant funding would be used to improve retention and success of Latinx students. This is especially pertinent because HSIs represent 14% of all higher education institutions, yet serve more than 64% of all Hispanic students (HACU, 2018). If we sorted these campuses by ones that had robust TPW programs, the numbers would probably be less. This means that TPW programs are likely not connecting with the vast majority of Latinx students. Moreover, although not all HSIs are similar in geography or demography, many of the students attending HSIs are also first-generation college students.

Furthermore, because the HSI designation is not part of the founding or purpose of these institutions, but is rather connected to a student demographic percentage, the HSI designation is less actively utilized as part of the organizing identity than other institutional designations. In other words, the HSI designation is not part of the core institutional mission, nor is it reflected in the faculty demographics. As a result, there is a gap between the proportion of Latinx students and communities served by HSIs and the proportion of Latinx faculty and values in leadership and institutional identity (Garcia, 2017). Therefore,
the challenge to centralize Latinx in a space where this was not part of the institution’s history, or reflected in its dominant narrative, mirrors the challenge faced in TPW to centralize counter narratives (Jones, Moore, & Walton, 2016). As Matveeva (2015) argued before us, technical and professional writing at HSIs is undertheorized and underdeveloped, and yet it represents a growing number of institutions and students in our programs. We argue that paying closer attention to developing and sustaining TPW programs at HSIs will help our field take up the call of Jones, Moore, & Walton (2016) “to make visible competing (i.e., a collection of nondominant) narratives about the work our field can and should do” (pp. 211-12).

Previous Work on TPW at HSIs
Previous studies have begun exploring the development and sustainability of TPW programs at HSIs. For example, Jones, Savage, and Yu (2014) advocate for diversity as an important dimension of user-centered design in course and program descriptions. Savage & Matveeva (2011) emphasize that understanding the context and histories of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU’s) and Tribal colleges is a critical component of analyzing TPW programs at these institutions, and we believe the same is true for HSIs. Through her survey of course catalogue offerings, Matveeva (2015) also suggests that TPW programs at HSIs could benefit from leveraging Latinx students language skills through program offerings, such as specific courses that help students explore diversity issues and their cultural heritage and courses that connect students and local businesses through projects for specific clients, and could further prepare Latinx students in TPW by addressing potential language barriers, teaching courses on diversity and workplace communication, and identifying students’ needed skills for employability (pp. 12-13). While Matveeva’s recommendations are invaluable and important, we also recognize that implementing these recommendations requires changes to how TPW is conceptualized as a field and how this field is delivered on campuses with Latinx students.

Although not directly related to HSI TPW program development, other scholars in the field of TPW address issues of localization and racial diversity in TPW curricula. For example, scholars like Medina (2014), Danuz (2014), and Kynard (2007) push for a more fluid understanding of language and linguistic standardization in TPW scholarship and pedagogies. In her work on TPW programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), McKoy (2018) emphasizes the need to move beyond recruitment to sustainability when seeking to increase diversity in TPW programs. As McKoy (2018) explains, “one way that I see the academy changing is by opening the space for the production
of scholarship that will center communities and cultures that are not
dominant, charging readers/scholars alike to do much of that unpack-
ing to understand labor, and even sometimes being uncomfortable” (128-9). TPW programs need to not only recruit diverse students, but
also incorporate students’ diverse communicative practices and racial
and cultural assets as foundational aspects of how programs are built.

Recently, work in TPW has also centralized the importance of
embracing a social justice mission in TPW curricula, enacting our field’s
“turn toward a collective disciplinary redressing of social injustice
sponsored by rhetorics and practices that infringe upon, neglect, with-
hold, and/or abolish human, non-human animal, and environmental
rights” (Haas & Eble, 2018, p. 5). In their collection, Haas and Eble (2018)
and their contributors imagine and introduce “socially-just futures
for our discipline, programs, and professions inspired by the work of
emerging and established scholars and practitioners” (p. 5). Further-
more, Haas’ (2012) groundbreaking work on race in TPW helped our
field to acknowledge that racial and ethnic diversity are “key to what
can be imagined, what gets imagined, and who imagines in our profes-
sion” (p. 279). Acknowledging and understanding the specific context-
tual factors of HSIs are critical to embracing and sustaining the diver-
sity that the field of TPW has and continues to work hard to support. As
this project further illustrates, sustaining diversity in TPW and localiz-
ing TPW programs for Latinx students specifically, requires a navigation
of structural challenges not only at the programmatic and institutional
levels, but also at the disciplinary level, where, as Cecilia Shelton (2020)
describes, “scholarship and pedagogy in the field continue to repro-
duce rigid notions of what kinds of people, products, and processes
count as technical,” and, “[a]s a result, the study of specialized com-
munication practices and ethics, social responsibility, and social justice
come off as ‘special topics’ rather than central themes in the framework
of our field’s history, theory, practice, and pedagogy” (p. 20).

Methodology and Methods
While research like Matveeva’s (2015) provides one example of how
TPW programs are being adapted at HSIs and offers strategies for sup-
porting students in TPW programs at HSIs, this work was based largely
on external analyses of program websites and public course offerings.
We build on this work by studying TPW programs from within HSIs,
which helps us to understand program development contextualized
in individual communities and settings. At the same time, we aim to
update previous strategies for localizing TPW curricula at HSIs through
asset-based frameworks as faculty who have (some) influence in devel-
oping programs inherently for Latinx students.
As we described in the previous section, there are specific contextual factors at HSIs that limit and afford program development: namely, HSIs are growing, and yet are underrepresented and underfunded; there are a relative high number of Latinx students and yet, their presence is typically centralized in institutional or program level work. Given these factors, our method and methodology for understanding and developing TPW programs at HSIs should not only follow standard program assessment and development practices. The findings we present in this article stem from a longitudinal study that we developed to answer the following questions:

• What (if any) approaches and practices have TPW programs at HSIs already used to develop responsive programs for Latinx students?
• What specific challenges, affordances, and opportunities do faculty and students face as they develop and partake in TPW at HSIs?
• How can the HSI designation be more directly integrated into the development and sustainability of TPW programs at HSIs?

At the time of this research, the three of us worked at HSIs in different US regions, in English departments with emerging interests, offerings, and/or programs in TPW. For this reason, we had access to Latinx student and faculty perspectives at both our home institutions and through our connections across the country. Although both Dayley and Walton (2018) and Popham (2016) highlight the importance of understanding diverse students’ perspectives on TPW curriculum and programmatic design, the voices of diverse populations such as Latinx students and faculty are frequently underrepresented in programmatic studies on TPW. For instance, Dayley and Walton report that out of 325 students that they surveyed from 51 institutions, “the vast majority of students who responded to the survey identified as solely White (84%)” (p. 22). This leads us to extrapolate that the methods for getting Latinx student perspectives on TPW program design may require more personal contact and shifts in methodology, moving away from standardized survey processes to more individualized conversations, which is why we decided to begin this study by discussing our own institutional journeys and then reaching out to faculty to conduct individual interviews.

**Testimonio Methodologies**

While we present the findings of this study as those deriving from interviews with TPW faculty at HSIs, it’s important to note that our approach to conducting these interviews draws from the Chicana Feminist practice of testimonios (Perez Huber, 2009). Chicana feminist educator J. Estrella Torrez (2015) explains that “as both a methodology and a pedagogy, testimonios emerge from within Chicana and Latina
feminist scholarship as knowledges that challenge the hegemonic methodologies which may systematically subordinate Chicanas and Latinas” (106). While on the surface testimonios and the practice of testimoniando may seem to resemble a typical interview protocol, as Estefania Castillo (2020) explains in her discussion of using testimonios in user-experience research, testimonios centralize the voices of marginalized people and illustrate how “our experiences are not just individual, but are instead affected by our interactions with others and influenced by structural oppression and colonialism” (p. 23).

In developing the protocol for this project, it was important for the three of us as authors of this paper to share testimonios about our own experiences working to localize TPW curricula for Latinx students at our institutions, and to incorporate these testimonios in our relationship-building with other HSI faculty. At the time that we conducted the research for this project, Laura, a bilingual Latina immigrant from Bolivia, was working to develop a TPW program at an HSI situated on the Mexico/US border in the Southwest. Kendall, a Chicanx, was recently hired as an assistant professor specializing in Latinx/Chicanx rhetoric at her undergraduate alma mater in rural Northern California, which had recently been designated as an HSI. Ann, a white woman, was working to develop a TPW program at a recently designated HSI near the Mexico/US border in the Southwest.

Sharing testimonios about how we as authors of this paper navigated our own institutional infrastructures was an important part of this project, as these testimonios helped us draw connections between our experiences while also helping us develop a method for listening to the experiences of our participants. For example, in sharing our testimonios, the three of us realized that as junior faculty, we faced similar challenges when pitching the idea of implementing TPW curricula in traditional, literature-dominant English departments, where tenured faculty did not share our perspectives on the potential of TPW as an area of interest for Latinx students. In testimonio methodology, the goal is not to “fix” someone’s problem or experiences with oppression, but rather to listen and reflect with the testimonialista to build community and demonstrate support (Castillo, 2020, p. 24). Following the sharing of our own testimonios and in subsequent discussions of our experiences, the three of us as researchers developed a protocol for reaching out to other TPW faculty at HSIs. The goal of this research was to set up interviews with faculty not to extract knowledge from participants, but rather to build community with faculty in similar positions in order to develop collective strategies for program development and success.
Participant Recruitment. First, along with the help of a research assistant, we identified all other TPW programs at HSIs across the United States. We identified TPW programs at 49 HSIs and made note of their individual program titles as well as their listed program directors. Then, we reached out to the directors listed at these institutions to solicit interviews from TPW faculty for this study. When the program directors were not available, we asked for suggestion of program faculty who would be willing to participate in this study.

We started recruiting HSI faculty interview participants in fall 2018. To recruit participants, we began by looking up TPW faculty at the institutions listed in Matveeva’s (2015) study of catalog descriptions of TPW courses at HSIs. We emailed these faculty to introduce ourselves and our study and to invite them to participate in interviews. When this approach yielded fewer responses than we had hoped, we decided to each reach out individually to faculty at other HSIs in our respective states. This approach still yielded fewer responses than we’d hoped, so we posted an invitation on Facebook and Twitter, to which we received more responses. As we began conducting interviews in late 2018 and early 2019, we also asked our interviewees to connect us with other HSI TPW faculty. For example, one of our participants invited a colleague to join her for the interview, and she also put us in touch with a faculty member at another institution who also agreed to be interviewed. In total, we interviewed eight faculty members and included our own three testimonios for a total of 11 faculty at 10 HSIs in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. Of the 11 total faculty represented in this study, 8 faculty are white women and 3 faculty are Latinas. At the time of the interviews, eight of the faculty participants were assistant professors, two were associate professors, and one was a lecturer. Table 1 presents the institutions represented in this study.

Table 1: HSI TPW Programs that Responded to our Query

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TPW Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Undergraduate certificate in Professional and Technical Writing; Undergraduate major and minor in Professional and Technical Writing proposed; MA and PhD in Rhetoric, Composition, and the Teaching of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Undergraduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Undergraduate courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 1 illustrates, we were able to connect with faculty at 10 different HSIs. We then scheduled virtual interviews with faculty at each of these institutions, in order to better understand how TPW programs were developed at these institutions, if and how the HSI identity is incorporated into these TPW programs, and the challenges, affordances, and opportunities that faculty in these programs face as they continue developing their programs.

When participants agreed to be interviewed, we shared an informed consent form with them to sign in advance of the interview, a video conferencing link, and a note that we were planning on 40 minutes for the interview. As we scheduled interviews, we tried to ensure that at least two of us would be available to conduct the interview, so that one person could focus on conducting the interview and the other could focus on note-taking. When each video conferencing session began, we introduced ourselves and the study and asked...
permission to record the session. Thus, we collected both audio/video recordings and our written notes from the sessions. Following a testimonio methodology, as we listened to our participants’ discussion, we also shared pieces of our own experiences and made connections to our own institutions, treating this less as a formal interview and more as a way to connect experiences across institutions. We asked each of the 12 questions in our protocol to each interviewee, but we also maintained flexibility in the ordering of questions and in the follow-up questions we asked, according to the natural flow of the conversation and of interviewees’ stories and responses. For example, after asking Question 8, “Does your department/program currently offer a specific degree in TPW or a related field?” and receiving a negative response, we often asked a follow-up question along the lines of “Would your department be supportive of offering a TPW program?” As conversations unfolded, we also reciprocated with stories and examples from our own institutions and experiences. Our semi-structured interview protocol included the following questions:

1. Talk to me a little about your background/current major and what led you to work and/or study at your University.
2. What is your understanding of HSI campuses? How did you come to this understanding?
3. What is your own view about this institutional designation?
4. What are your thoughts on the way this designation could connect HSI institutions?
5. What are the activities that your department or organization currently conducts to support this institution designation?
6. What other activities could your department or organization do to support this designation?
7. What would you like to see happen in classes to support this institutional designation?
8. Does your department/program currently offer a specific degree in TPW or a related field?
9. If so, can you tell us about the development of this program? When was it established? Who established it? What changes has this program undergone? What prompted these changes?
10. Describe your institutional context. What resources are available in your campus? In your community? Describe your department/program context. What resources are available? What are your limitations?
11. Describe the faculty demographic in your program/department/college (including disciplinary focus, backgrounds). Describe the student demographic in your program/department/
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12. If you don’t offer a program in TPW, does your department/program offer any coursework in this area? What resources would be needed to build a program?

Data Analysis
As we conducted the interviews, our research team met periodically to identify and discuss emerging patterns across the conversations (Saldaña, 2013). Because we had already shared our own institutional experiences with each other through our testimonios, we also included our own experiences in the analysis both as additional data sets. While some standardized research protocols may discourage researchers from including their own perspectives and experiences as they analyze data, a Chicana Feminist approach and testimonio methodology demonstrate that incorporating researchers’ experiences in data analysis allows researchers and participants to connect and develop shared practices, which is the goal of our approach to building TPW pedagogies for Latinx students at HSIs. Through this iterative, reflexive process, we articulated four emergent patterns from our interview data:

- TPW programs and curriculum pay very little explicit, intentional attention to their institution’s HSI designation
- Campus locales have regional differences and affordances
- Pedagogy conversations focus less on the student population and more on the faculty demographic—specifically, most faculty have addressed a lack of diverse faculty teaching in these programs and the assumed impact this has on program design
- Individual faculty enact smaller scale best practices to counteract the lack of systematic support

These emergent patterns will inform the next stages of our ongoing research; here, we discuss each pattern and offer specific examples from our interview conversations. To respect the privacy of the faculty we interviewed, the participants are referred to anonymously in the discussion.

Pattern 1: TPW programs and curriculum pay very little explicit, intentional attention to their institution’s HSI designation. As we discuss the HSI designation and identity, we acknowledge the concerns of Latinx faculty and students with the use of the term, “Hispanic.” One participant noted the term is “loaded and political,” adding that “if you say ‘Hispanic’ at [my institution], the students will call you out for using a colonizing term.” This is because “Hispanic,” with its focus on Spanish origins, does not do justice to the complexity of identities in Latinx communities, and privileges white/European notions of Latinx
identity while also erasing Black, Brown, and Indigenous Latinxs. This participant also expressed concern that the HSI designation can be an excuse to not do more to support students, especially in curriculum. For example, when this participant was a student at another HSI, they could not get a degree in Chicanx studies. Still, they acknowledged, as did all our participants, that the HSI designation opens up strategic funding opportunities.

Indeed, nearly all participants described a disconnect between the institutional designation—often associating it with grant and funding opportunities and with campus-wide student support organizations—and the local curriculum. As one participant put it, “at the university level, people are getting [National Science Foundation] grants for HSIs,” but “our programs don’t seem to encounter it as directly. It feels slower to figure out what HSI means on this campus beyond the federal designation language.” In several conversations, interviewees noted that individual faculty and student experiences are often the only bridge between the institutional designation and program curriculum. For example, a participant noted that individual faculty in the TPW minor at her institution participate in campus-wide HSI initiatives, but “there’s no direct, programmatic connection between those efforts to attend to the needs of HSI students and our minor.” Another participant noted that while the faculty at her institution are not reflective of the HSI identity, students engage with the HSI identity throughout their campus experiences, primarily through community engagement projects.

A further complicating factor is that, as several faculty acknowledged, in addition to issues with navigating HSI identity, TPW courses and programs are also navigating the boundaries and politics of disciplinarity, sometimes in limiting ways. One participant described the difficulty their department has not just in recruiting faculty of color in TPW but also in securing a tenure-track line when upper administration does not see TPW as a research area. Another participant noted the influence of the politics of the departmental home of TPW in shaping the program: “I’m not sure that HSI identity influenced the development of the program [as much as] it has to do with who was in leadership.”

However, there are past, present, and possible future program iterations that connect with HSI identity. For example, one participant acknowledged that their institution was “founded by a lot of Chicanx scholars and faculty, but somewhere that voice has been lost over the last 25 years. We don’t have a first-year writing program or TPW. People believe that professionals in disciplines should be teaching writing. So while we started as a progressive Chicanx/Latinx institution, we are
now STEM-focused, and those departments teach their students TPW.” This participant expressed hope that those roots might inform more collaboration between humanities and STEM, with TPW potentially serving as a bridge. Another participant acknowledged that in professional writing at their institution, “we don’t have a cultural literacy emphasis,” but noted that building a program focused on non-profit organizations draws ethnically diverse students.

Several faculty noted possible future directions for engaging HSI identity in TPW curriculum. One participant noted that their program could emphasize the importance of bilingualism and multicultural knowledge, explaining that “we’re portfolio oriented [as a program], but navigating cultural issues is also important, and there should be a way to encourage the value of that in our programs.” Similarly, another participant reported that they and their colleagues were engaged in the process of revising the standard curriculum for their Introduction to Technical Writing course, which serves a diverse student population, and that they planned to bring up how their learning outcomes and assignments support diverse students.

Pattern 2: Campus locales have regional differences and affordances. While there are certainly commonalities across HSIs in terms of student population and campuses failing to fully integrate HSI identity on a larger scale, it is important to acknowledge differences and affordances of different locations, even within the U.S. Southwest. Perhaps unsurprisingly, institutions located close to the Mexico-U.S. border are more likely to have students who commute to their campuses from Mexican cities. But there are also differences in what diversity looks like and what the term “Hispanic” encompasses at different HSIs, particularly in California. As one participant, who moved from New Mexico to California, explained, “diversity is different in California and New Mexico. At [my former institution] it means mostly Chicanx and Latinx students, but at [my current institution] we also have Asian, Pacific Islander, and African American students. Our assumptions about the students in our classes and how we approach engaging them with theories/frameworks connected to Chicanx and Latinx experiences have to be a little more diverse or open here. There are more students from Central America here, for example. So that informs how I now understand what an HSI looks like.” Similarly, other California HSI faculty noted that their institutions also serve Asian and Pacific Islander students, even as one of them also described their institution as “still a Predominantly White Institution.”

Even among California HSIs, though, relative proximity to major urban areas and industries shapes the relationship of TPW classes/pro-
grams with professional and community organizations. For example, one participant from a California HSI mentioned that many of their institution’s students go to work in Silicon Valley, and that “Silicon Valley has a call for hiring more Hispanic students.” Another participant from a California HSI noted that every student in their TPW minor is paired with an internship, regardless of track, and that faculty are incentivized with course releases to find high quality internships that are paid, to work with organizations to design internships, and to serve as a liaison between students and community members. But as yet another participant from a California HSI observed, “the communities around our institutions are very different, and that makes a difference. [My institution’s] local community is rural and not as diverse, so we don’t have the connections to the immediate community.” This participant noted, furthermore, that the material conditions of students shape how they participate in programs, and in the case of her institution, “sixty percent of students are first generation, and many are low income and food/housing insecure.”

We observed a similar phenomenon regarding the campus relationship to urban industry centers in comparing, for example, one participant’s account of campus internship fairs that are deeply engaged with the professional community in a major Texas city, including the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, with another participant’s account of the challenges of building community at a commuter campus nestled between two other major Texas cities. And we also noticed that even within a department at a single institution, diversity can look different between undergraduate and graduate program locations. For example, one participant who attended an HSI for their master’s degree observed that the institution’s HSI identity was not reflected in its graduate student population. Another participant noted that in their current institution’s graduate program, supporting international students means supporting students not only from Mexico but also from countries around the world, leading them to wonder if, in that case, HSI-targeted programming would fail to support other international students. As we reflect on our campuses, we note that while our student demographics are changing, many graduate programs tend to be comprised primarily of white, U.S. born students or non-Latinx international students. HSI designation as a centralized identity is not yet reflected in faculty demographics, which was another recurrent theme that emerged in the interviews.
Pattern 3: Pedagogy conversations focus less on the student population and more on the faculty demographic—specifically, most faculty have addressed a lack of diverse faculty teaching in these programs and the assumed impact this has on program design. Considering that of the 11 total faculty represented in this study, 8 faculty are white women and 3 faculty are Latinxs, we are a microcosm of a systemic problem in HSIs, where faculty are often still predominantly white. As one participant put it, “Faculty make the program, so it depends on who is there.” They noted that their own program struggles to hire African American and Latinx faculty, and that “if we were more diverse, there might be more courses developed that reflect that.” Another participant described their department as about 95% white and the rhetoric and professional communication faculty as 100% white. Similarly, another participant noted, “We have a lot of white people in our department. Our faculty don’t mirror our diverse student population, and students need to see faculty of color in the classroom, to know they can do that and help them navigate the university.” And another participant noted that despite the fact that their institution’s writing program hires not only PhDs but also people with professional experience from a range of disciplinary backgrounds, the program is still “almost entirely white.” Only one participant reported that at their institution, “we have a lot of strong faculty of color,” which “is good, because diversity is spread through our department, and it’s not questioned as much.”

The mismatch between HSI TPW faculty and student identities at many institutions creates barriers for designing TPW curriculum and experiences that support Latinx students. For example, one participant noted that many of their institution’s students go work in Silicon Valley, where “job ads are asking for bilingual skills,” which led them to wonder, “We are a portfolio-based program, but for portfolios for multilingual writers—with faculty not speaking the language, how do we grade them?” Perhaps not surprisingly, several faculty mentioned discussions and plans to recruit diverse faculty, some more concrete than others. Another participant noted that in accordance with an institution-wide focus, “in professional writing, border rhetorics is our next hire.” Another participant noted that despite their department’s current hiring freeze, they are discussing how to recruit and retain diverse faculty, though “someone coming in would be coming into a really white environment.” Another participant noted that their program’s efforts to secure a tenure-track hire in TPW were thwarted when the line was changed to non-tenure-track at the last minute, and that they felt conflicted because while they want to recruit faculty of color,
there is concern about the line being non-tenure-track. As several previous studies illustrate, diverse representation in both students and faculty is critical to sustaining diversity in TPW programs (Jones, Savage, & Yu, 2014; Popham, 2016; Walton & Dayley, 2018; Savage & Mattson, 2011; Savage & Matveeva, 2011), and, our participants suggest, in TPW programs at HSIs.

The institutional status of TPW faculty is also a related concern. The previous participant’s concern about a non-tenure-track line was echoed by another participant, who said that even in a program in which the vast majority of faculty are lecturers, “My saying these things as a lecturer has only so much weight for the people who need to hear it. People with tenure lines would carry more weight.” We note, furthermore, that even in tenure-track TPW lines, the labor of curriculum building often seems to fall to untenured faculty. For example, a participant described working on TPW curriculum as an untenured faculty member themselves along with another untenured faculty member who has since left her institution. At the time of this study, the three authors of this essay were also all untenured faculty who are taking or took on leadership roles in TPW curriculum and program work at their institutions without tenure, while also working to establish their own research trajectories. As a participant pointed out, the fact that these practices are individualized, and as we note, may be taken up by contingent and/or untenured faculty, is “part of a labor problem,” noting that supporting students “happens a ton one-on-one, with great mentoring, but it doesn’t happen in a systematic way right now. … It’s revolved around individual faculty efforts.”

**Pattern 4: Individual faculty enact smaller scale best practices.** Despite the fact that many of the faculty at HSIs, particularly in English departments, are non-tenure track or junior faculty without much institutional power, in our interviews, we found connecting with the HSI identity to occur more frequently at the micro level of individual faculty best practices. While programs might suggest that faculty consider designing their curriculum with the HSI designation in mind, the faculty in our interviews noted that it was often left up to the discretion of the individual faculty to connect their pedagogies to the HSI identity, as this identity often did not fully drive program-wide curricular decisions. One participant described an institutional culture with a program-wide committee on equity and inclusivity that recommends curricular changes to faculty, like diversifying course readings with authors of color and revising assignments to engage with race, class, gender, and ability, but that the recommendations are “opt-in” and therefore still implemented at the choice of individual faculty. As a
result, this participant acknowledged, “some people opting in are the people who already have those conversations,” while others who do not see those issues as an important may not opt in. And yet, many of our interviewees see potential to innovative their curriculum by connecting TPW with being at an HSI.

The ability to engage underrepresented students with community work is an accepted high impact practice that retains students. As such, several faculty acknowledged the potential of leveraging TPW’s focus on collaboration and community engagement as a best practice for supporting students and engaging HSI identity. One participant remarked that “tech comm does collaboration and community building well” and that they would like to see that strength emphasized across the board in their institution’s technical writing classes in ways that support students’ ways of knowing and building community—“not just in classes but also in their communities” and “not just community service but also something that they learn and take back to their [students’] community.”

Additionally, faculty are implementing best practices on a more individual level that have potential to scale up to a programmatic level. For example, one participant channeled their department’s commitment to social justice, community engagement, and service learning to propose a TPW course on community engagement and social justice that focuses on writing grants to fund and support community engaged work. This work at the individual course level could serve as a model for future programmatic efforts if it becomes institutionally and departmentally supported. As this participant explained, “Since we do have a huge service learning institute, it would be amazing to have students [in her department’s other courses and concentration areas] “getting out into the community to see writing in context and in action, as creating and sustaining change in local community.” In connecting the HSI identity to TPW, faculty saw opportunities for reshaping community engagement pedagogies to extend beyond service-learning models to more reciprocal, sustainable methods for developing community partnerships at the program level. In addition, while community engagement and collaborations with nonprofits are important and valuable, our interviewees also noted opportunities for Latinx students in TPW programs at HSIs to leverage their skills in connecting with industry professionals and businesses who increasingly

---

1 We were encouraged that this faculty member did note that at a recent faculty meeting, listening to the conversations and recommendations had become mandatory for all faculty. It does still though put the onus on the individual faculty.
need diverse, bilingual perspectives in the tech sector.

**Implications**

A testimonio approach to interviewing TPW faculty at HSIs helped us see that although there is interest and some movement in developing more TPW programs at HSIs, efforts to centralize Latinx students’ perspectives, histories, and interests within these programs are rarely happening at a programmatic or institutional level. Given long-documented evidence that TPW as a field has a fluid identity that is not always understood or valued at a departmental or University level, particularly given the fact that many TPW programs are situated in literature-focused English departments (see Dayley & Walton, 2018), TPW programs at HSIs are not always supported with tenure-track hires and institutionalized or mandatory curricular initiatives. As another participant acknowledged, when people think about programs that connect with Latinx students, they often think of literature—particularly courses in Chicano and Latinx literature—rather than TPW. Indeed, the lack of discussion in the field about engaging Latinx students motivated us to conduct the present study. Further, as our interviews demonstrate, TPW programs at HSIs are primarily situated in teaching-focused institutions with high teaching loads. As such, innovation for Latinx-tailored TPW curricula within these institutions is often reliant on already over-committed faculty who are not compensated for these efforts, or who have the time or the power to make large curricular shifts in their programs. When Latinx faculty are hired to work in TPW programs at HSIs, issues of institutionalized racism may impact faculty support and retention, particularly when junior faculty are given large administrative responsibility without the necessary departmental or institutional support. In short, our preliminary findings point to several institutional constraints relative to developing localized TPW programs for and with Latinx students.

At the same time, however, our conversations with faculty at different HSIs also led us to begin brainstorming possibilities for combining resources, strategies, and practices for developing TPW programs not only within but across HSIs. Johnson, Simmons, & Sullivan (2018) explain that TPW programs are often positioned in “lean” environments that lack material resources and support for programmatic development. This notion of a “lean” environment is further amplified when combined with structural racism that limits resources and opportunities for marginalized students, as is the case with some Latinx students (and faculty) at HSIs: from erasures and marginalization of Latinx students’ and professionals’ experiences in the field’s scholarship, to deficit-based pedagogies for Latinx students, and from the lack
of inclusion of Latinx people in faculty and administrative positions, to macro and micro aggressions experienced by Latinx students and faculty.

Still, lean TPW programs, such as those situated at some HSIs, can continue to thrive by being “strategic in their mobilizations,” specifically, we argue, by finding ways to centralize, share, and disseminate resources and strategies beyond single departments and institutions (Johnson, Simmons, & Sullivan, 2018, p. xv). Based on our preliminary findings, then, in this section, we provide implications and recommendations both for faculty developing and sustaining TPW programs at HSIs and for those who want to support TPW programmatic initiatives for Latinx students in various contexts.

**Desire and need for building coalitions and sharing resources among TPW programs in HSIs.** Through our conversations with faculty teaching and/or directing TPW programs at HSIs, we noted an interest in developing coalitions (Walton, Moore, & Jones, 2019; Jones, 2020) and networks across institutions for faculty who teach and work with Latinx students in TPW. Many of our interviewees noted that they feel isolated as TPW faculty in their departments and institutions, often bearing the burden of having to define, justify, and/or introduce TPW as well as its value and importance in their departments. By establishing platforms for connecting faculty across HSIs who are interested in or currently developing TPW curricula that centralizes Latinx experiences, we can perhaps share the labor of illustrating the value and importance of localized TPW programs for our students. As we continue to work on this project, we aim to foster this coalitional network of TPW teachers and administrators at HSIs, primarily by co-presenting on panels and workshops with faculty at other HSIs (including the participants in this study), by attending and building TPW at HSI professional development events, and by developing an online platform where TPW instructors can share resources, strategies, and descriptions of their localized curricula.

**Connecting with TPW faculty, initiatives, and programs at non-HSIs.** As is the case with any effort to increase diversity and inclusion, we recognize that the work of valuing and centralizing Latinx experiences in TPW cannot rely solely on faculty from a specific demographic (i.e., HSI faculty), many of whom are already teaching high course loads while meeting extensive service and community commitments in their local contexts. Instead, we aim to highlight the value of Latinx experiences, histories, and expertise within the field of TPW more broadly, embracing and pushing for an antenarrative of the field “that seeks to
destabilize and unravel aspects of the tightly woven dominant narrative about who we are as a field, what we do, where our work occurs, and what we value” (Jones, Walton, & Moore, 2016, p. 212). Taking up the challenge of recruitment and inclusion of Latinx students and perspectives in TPW can happen through programmatic shifts across institutions that push more Latinx orientations in program development. These types of changes, particularly when they happen at R1 institutions with high visibility, can alleviate some of the challenges that HSI faculty face when justifying the value that Latinx students and faculty bring to TPW as a field, and vice versa.

Developing research frameworks and methodologies that appeal to Latinx communities. One of the things we learned early on in this study is that traditional research methods, frameworks, and approaches would not be effective in trying to understand Latinx student and faculty perspectives on TPW. Our initial recruitment efforts for getting interview participants, including formal and standardized email invitations, yielded little response. In addition, we found early in our interview process that asking standardized questions during the interviews did not always allow us to get insights into faculty perspectives. Instead, we found it valuable to not only ask questions but to also share our own experiences as HSI faculty during the interview process, engaging in a testimonio method that allowed us to connect with our participants. As we move forward with this project, we thus plan to continue developing ways of reaching our desired participants and collaborators through methods that respect the limited time that Latinx faculty and students already have to engage in research, particularly at teaching-intensive institutions. As the field of TPW pushes for more social-justice-driven approaches to research and teaching with marginalized students and faculty, we hope to further engage in conversations about how we can increase inclusion and representation in our programmatic studies through more grounded and localized research methods.

Conclusion
While we recognize that the data presented in this article provides a small glimpse of TPW faculty perspectives at HSIs, our findings also helped us see the innovative work that some faculty are already engaging in as they localize their TPW curricula for Latinx students and communities. Testimonio methods in particular helped us see participants’ responses in a contextualized manner that helped us draw connections across HSIs and TPW programs. In our next research phase, we aim to 1) continue to connect with other faculty interested
in supporting and sustaining Latinx perspectives in their curricular goals, and 2) integrate Latinx student voices and experiences into our research and program design. Drawing on Johnson, Simmons, & Sullivan’s (2018) description of “lean” TPW programs as “innovative and disruptive, responsive, attuned, sustainable, and strategic,” we seek to continue developing a set of growing priorities, strategies, and pedagogical practices that can positively influence Latinx TPW students and the faculty, administrators, and communities who support them (p. xv). In other words, we seek to build knowledges from and connections among HSI TPW students, faculty, administrators, and communities. These knowledges and connections build upon and contribute to the social justice turn in our field. After all, as Haas & Eble (2018) argue, “all technical communication contexts are multi- and inter-cultural and influenced by institutions and systems of power”, and as a result, “social justice approaches to technical communication better position us in any context to better advocate for technological and scientific change in equitable ways” (p. 8). Localizing TPW curricula, pushing for institutional support for Latinx students, and expanding TPW’s research methods to further support Latinx perspectives are just some of the many goals we hope to continue working toward as we embrace TPW’s growing emphasis on social justice.
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The Minor is Major: An Adhocratic, Relationship-Based View of TPC Curriculum and Curriculum Revision
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**Abstract.** This article is a case study analysis that proposes that TPC minors can be, metaphorically speaking, major—major for the field of TPC, in terms of value and legitimacy; major for local and broad-ranging communities, in terms of connections and contributions; major for the departments that house TPC minors, in terms of relationship-building and visibility; and major for academic institutions’ outreach and community commitments. Framed by the theoretical work of Spinuzzi (2015) and his concept of adhocratic, this case study ultimately illustrates that for this particular case, the impact of the TPC minor is far-reaching for stakeholders both within and external to the institution.
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The use of the terms “major” and “minor” as assigned to a student’s experience within an academic institution are constructs that not only delineate study, but also—by the very employment of such terms—articulate value. Such value is applied to cultural and institutional understandings of the experiences students gain, and of their perceived value on any given institutional campus and beyond. As fields, cultures, trends, job markets, and other contexts continue to shift towards more distributed models (Gee, 2009), our institutional understandings and evaluations of “majors” and “minors” appear to lag in some ways—most often, rather than responding flexibly to rapidly-changing contexts, institutional curriculum codi-
ties in-the-moment practices that then take decades to dislodge and revise. While Technical and Professional Communication (TPC) instructors recognize the dialogic and continual nature of revision, and the need for it, we also recognize that institutional structures and processes can hamper our ability to be as responsive and responsible to context in ways we might prefer or that are most beneficial.

With all this in mind, we have taken time to reflect on our work in our institution, and we present a case study of the development of our Professional and Technical Writing minor. This case study is meant to provide lessons learned upon reflection that may apply to other TPC programs, especially as our field recognizes the importance of sustainable, “lean” approaches to programmatic development (Johnson, Simmons, and Sullivan, 2018). Our case suggests that TPC minors can be, metaphorically speaking, major. Major for the field of TPC, in terms of value and legitimacy; major for local and broad-ranging communities, in terms of connections and contributions; major for the departments that house TPC minors, in terms of relationship-building and visibility; major for academic institutions’ outreach and community commitments.

Our case study draws together examples from the authors’ experiences in revising, recruiting, retaining, and connecting TPC minor students to networks across and external to the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. We situate these experiences within current TPC scholarship, which has illuminated for us some of the ways we’ve changed over the past decade and provides direction for how we might continue to develop. Taking stock of other TPC cases and broad developments in the field has helped us understand trends we see on our campus, in our English department, in our classrooms, and in our community. Taking stock of our trajectory over the past decade, we realize that many of the curricular decisions we made have been tacit responses to trends outlined in contemporary TPC literature, and making those connections—between what the field is seeing and what we are seeing locally—explicit has proven valuable for strategic planning and development.

Upon reflection, we don’t see TPC minors as “minor.” We see them as value-added locations—for practitioners, for instructors, for students, for departments, for institutions, for larger communities—as relationship-builders and as integral parts of students’ experiences at their educational institutions and beyond. Reflecting on our own minor’s development prompts us now to advocate for teachers and practitioners of TPC to recognize the linchpin nature of TPC not only in terms of power and legitimacy, but also through the responsiveness
and relationship-building capacity of TPC.

**Literature Review: TPC, Relationship-Building, Curriculum-Building, and Power-full Structures**

**Bureaucracies, Adhocracies, and TPC Responsiveness**

As a field, TPC—its discursive practices, its scholars and practitioners, and its professional organizations—has long emphasized the importance of relationship-building, especially with regards to its attention to power-structures, to communication-based problem-solving (and barriers), and its necessity and commitment to addressing multiple stakeholders (for example, see: Grabill & Simmons, 1998; Kimme Hea & Wendler Shah, 2016; Schreiber & Melonçon, 2019; Shin, Pang, & Kim, 2015; Stephens, DeLorme, & Hagen, 2015; Walton, 2013). Attuned to issues of relationship-building, TPC scholars have recognized the importance of working across disciplines and across the academic/practitioner divide. The field’s efforts toward establishing these connections has led many scholars to argue that TPC programs are well-suited to respond to broad cultural and technological shifts in knowledge work (for example, see Di Renzo, 2010). Indeed, as Johnson-Eilola argued over twenty years ago, “technical communicators need to illustrate both to themselves and to the rest of the world that technology is easy to come by, but understanding and strategic use are both rare and valuable” (1996, p. 257). In the twenty years since Johnson-Eilola made this argument, knowledge work and the technologies with which we conduct knowledge work (including writing) have altered and, in many ways, become more complex. Reflecting on Johnson-Eilola’s statement in our current moment, we found that our program has sought to employ that same formula with regards to relationship-building, and we suspect that this could be a widespread practice among similarly “minor” TPC programs. Opportunities for relationships are vast and growing vaster, but understanding how to strategically connect and network those opportunities, and more so how to employ TPC practices, principles, and theories in multi-disciplinary and multi-contextual ways, is a rare, valuable skill that requires the kind of flexibility and nimbleness that a TPC minor can provide.

With such rapid shifts in information communication technologies (ICTs), the activity of relationship building and flexibility is more valuable than ever for technical and professional communicators. As Spinuzzi (2015) has recently illustrated, institutions are profoundly mediated by ICTs, which structure how information flows through organizations. To explain how changing ICTs have shaped organizations, Spinuzzi of-
fers the example of a typical graphic designer in 1970, 1990, and 2010. In 1970, the graphic designer worked in an advertising agency separated into major departments. She shares her equipment—such as drafting tables and clip art—with other members of the creative team in her department, and people tend to only communicate with others outside their departments through a manager or in a meeting. In 1990, the graphic designer was now part of inter-departmental task forces to discuss how the advertising agency should proceed with procuring new computers, desktop publishing software, and printers. Everyone on these task forces needed to be able to communicate what it is they do with the other members of the task force who lack expertise in that department. And in 2010, the graphic designer worked out of her home office, freelancing for many organizations including sometimes the advertising agency. She is untethered from the agency, but she finds herself tethered increasingly to her laptop and mobile phone. In addition to the graphic design work, she finds herself doing a lot of networking, as building and maintaining relationships has become a large part of her job (Spinuzzi, 2015, pp. 18-19).

As the example of the graphic designer shows, new ICTs change the way people collaborate, and much knowledge work has undergone a shift away from bureaucratic institutional structures toward adhocratic ones. Spinuzzi (2015) explains that bureaucratic organizations have long been characterized by a rigid division of labor, a reliance on narrow specializations and well-defined hierarchical levels, and insist upon managerial command and control. Rigid bureaucratic organizational structures may find themselves ill-suited to respond quickly to problems that require cross departmental perspectives because strong divisions of labor inhibit relationships between those departments. Institutional adhocracies became more common in the 1990s as responses to just these sorts of problems. Such adhocracies are characterized by a more fluid division of labor; they consist of teams of specialists who frequently cross boundaries and they exhibit a rotating leadership that requires command over teamwork but not control of co-workers (pp. 21-25). Institutional adhocracies emerged concomitantly with developments in mobile ICTs around the time Johnson-Eilola (1996) issued his clarion call for technical communicators.

---

1 As we will show later on in this article, we see the minor (as an institutional construct) as an example of the ways adhocracies manifest in response to contextual needs—of people, of organizations, of relationships, of institutions.
Relationship-Building In/Between Departments: Relationships Bring Advocacy

As we consider how we in TPC build and maintain intra- and extra-institutional relationships, we must recognize that the location of TPC within our teaching institutions also matter greatly. Indeed, as Sam Dragga (2010) notes in his introduction to a special issue of *Technical Communication Quarterly* dedicated to positioning programs in technical communication, the departmental location of a program significantly impacts how that program functions, and how students, teachers, and soon-to-be-practitioners understand the parameters of TPC.

Many have called attention to the difficulties of working within traditional bureaucratic structures to develop TPC programs, and a recurring theme is a lack of understanding among departmental colleagues about what the field of TPC values and practices. The theme of misunderstanding the field of TPC is particularly prevalent in narratives about TPC programs located in English departments (Miller, 1979; Sullivan & Porter, 1993; Porter & Sullivan, 2007; Rentz, 2001; Rentz, Debs, & Meloncon, 2010). In their account of establishing a professional writing minor within the University of Wyoming Department of English, Knievel, Belanger, Keeney, Couch, and Stebbins (2010) call attention to the seemingly simple act of naming their professional writing minor. The term “professional,” they note, was greeted with skepticism by their English department colleagues who found it counterproductive to what they saw as most important in a liberal education. Having established a professional writing minor, they note that the term “professional” is productively vague in that it allows for curricular flexibility, but that vagueness makes it difficult to argue for tenure-track faculty and long-term non-tenure track lines; moreover, “professional” is a term that allows for a troublesome amount of manipulation by administrators who see it as merely ornamental (p. 37). As such, even in the difficulty of a name that bifurcates people within a department, relationships cannot be assumed, but must be built and maintained.

Thus, one method for building relationships between TPC programs and English departments in which they’re housed has been to find common ground within the curriculum. For example, Welch (2011) acknowledged that rhetoric is “a legitimized, sanctioned subject” in English departments (p. 1), often because of the disciplinary overlap of literature and rhetorical studies scholars and theorists; she found it beneficial to build relationships with her departmental colleagues through a shared interest in rhetorical studies as she developed her professional writing minor at Longwood University. Accounts such as these highlight the difficulties that come with establishing and devel-
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Developing a TPC minor in a rigid bureaucratic structure organized around bureaucratic hiring procedures and administrative hierarchies. The relationship-building necessary to establish a TPC program, especially within an English department, can be a slow and arduous process necessitating continual persuasion, explanation, and definition.

But some TPC minors have found workarounds to these sorts of issues by embracing an institutional adhocratic approach to relationship building that works within bureaucratic structures yet reaches across boundaries to form shifting alliances. For example, Kungl and Hathaway (2010) describe their TPC minor as a solution to a widespread problem at Shippensburg University. With many programs feeling the need to prepare students for the IT job market while maintaining their traditional liberal arts offerings, Kungl and Hathaway worked with colleagues across the disciplines to develop a TPC minor that “would give students some substantive breadth and depth to preparation for the professional workplace, and [. . .] would spread the responsibility for this program among a number of participating departments, so as not to overly burden or alter the curricula of any one department” (p. 174). Their TPC minor flourished as a result of relationship-building across disciplines.

Building relationships within departments is important for TPC programs working within the bureaucratic organizational structure of the university, and building relationships across disciplines is important for establishing a flexible repertoire of shifting alliances consistent with institutional adhocracies. Because of the institutional nature of academic organizations, we can only speculate about an all-edge adhocratic approach to situating TPC programs. This approach might leave TPC programs, as Harlow (2010) puts it, “academically homeless” in an attempt to remain more flexible and responsive to student and community needs. All-edge TPC programs would not commit to the departmental structure that organizes most universities. In her “argument for academic homelessness,” Harlow observes that “for many of us teachers [of TPC], the idea of teaching in a technical and professional communication department is attractive. We must realize, though, that a departmental structure is not always the best way to advance our field or to serve our students” (p. 318). However, this lack of a departmental structure may need defending, Harlow notes: “Like the sophists, we find our work in many places; like the sophists, we find ourselves defending that very condition” (p. 320). Spinuzzi (2015) characterizes all-edge adhocracies as maintained through alliances. “An all-edge adhocracy,” he explains, “is voluntarily joined in an alliance of different specialists with their own motivations, expectations,
home organizations, and values” (p. 180). An all-edge adhocratic TPC program might find itself academically homeless, but such a program would thrive if it could form alliances across disciplines.

But we are not there yet. Most TPC programs are, for better and worse, housed in our academic “homes.” Again, many of us function as an institutional adhocracy by working within bureaucratic structures, yet reaching across institutional boundaries to form relationships. TPC programs thus have to find ways to function as institutional adhocracies, which calls for a certain kind of relationship-building; we’ve found that building relationships with community partners is an important aspect of that for us. Another set of relationships that is useful for TPC programs feeling the push-and-pull of functioning as an institutional adhocracy is with the communities in which those programs are located. As we will discuss below, these relationships have been key to making our Professional and Technical Writing minor into something major, and beginning the steps of moving towards an adhocratic model that relies on networks rather than bureaucracies and institutional structures for effectiveness, credibility, legitimacy, and most importantly, student success.

Community Partners, TPC Partners: Building on Service-Learning Models

Relationship-building in TPC is not a novel idea, though much of that work has been articulated through the lens of service-learning and community engagement in TPC. In particular, Kimme Hea and Wendler Shah (2016) argue that “The ways we describe the community partners and their involvement in service-learning often become the foundation upon which students build rapport, analyze organizational contexts, and assess community needs” (p. 49). As such, the descriptions and articulations of partnerships between universities, community members/organizations, and students help (or potentially hinder) students understand and construct a framework of values with which to understand the complex nexus of workplace communication, and the place and importance of relationships within that context.

One of the most important critiques within this nexus (Kimme Hea & Wendler Shah, 2016) is the call to move forward and address the hyperpragmatism that can result from service-learning practices. Drawing on Scott’s (2004) foundational article, “Rearticulating Civic Engagement through Cultural Studies and Service Learning,” which
calls attention to the dangers of hyperpragmatism in service-learning
technical communication courses—and which describes hyperprag-
matism as an ideology and a set of practices that aims primarily to
promote career success (p. 292), with a focus on conformity, clarity,
and efficiency—Kimme Hea and Wendler Shah call for TPC teachers to
use critical stakeholder theory “as a potential corrective to hyperprag-
matist perspectives on nonprofit participation” (p. 50). The employ-
ment of critical stakeholder theory is an important one for TPC, as “…
Stakeholder theory challenges technical communication teachers to
consider the range of people and groups involved in the deliverable
production, from university administrators, to instructors themselves,
to nonprofit staff, to those who volunteer, donate, and access services
from the nonprofit organizations, to the environment” (p. 51). This ap-
proach, then, works to address the complexity of individuals (and their
relationships) who might be affected by a document or set of prac-
tices, not just a flattened category of “supervisor” or “general public”.
Along with the specificity of stakeholder analysis, there is an attention
to the nexus of relationship within this approach, to engage not just
classification of individual, but relationships of and between individu-
als, institutions, their functions in this particular situation/context, and
the effects of those relationships on communicative acts.

That attention to complexity, and the anchor of attending to
relationships and investment, not static locations, through stakeholder
theory “…offers the potential to disrupt hyperpragmatism, because it
challenges service-learning practitioners in professional communica-
tion courses to intentionally explore the multiple stakes of nonprofit
partners, assessing value beyond only the exchange value or finan-
cial benefits of service-learning deliverables” (p. 51). This approach,
stitched with a “cultural studies approach” that involves “ethical en-
gagement with, critique of, and intervention into the conditions,
functions, and effects of value-laden practices (including discursive
ones)”, is the basis of our particular case study, where we consider how
this move away from the hyperpragmatic to the complexity of relation-
ships, ethics, and investment analysis beyond monetary means opens
the door for a kind of advocacy for TPC in ways that we did not antici-
pate when we first took up this work (pp. 49-50).

In the case study below, we establish the context with which our
minor operates, and we take a relationship-based view of curriculum
that focuses on how we have established relationships within and
outside the university:

• In our efforts to establish and maintain relationships within
  the university, we have designed our curriculum to align
with the institutional adhocracy of the university. We see our minor as a flexible means of partnering with other disciplines and departments in temporary, rotational, project-oriented work.

• In our efforts to establish and maintain relationships outside the university, we have built upon a service-learning model to enter what we are terming an interrelational-learning model, where benefits to all locations move beyond the pragmatic and institutional to the humanistic and relational.

Case Study in Institutional Background: How a Minor Became Major

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UWL) is a comprehensive four-year institution located between the Mississippi River and the driftless region of SW Wisconsin. One can see Minnesota from our office buildings. We're an institution of approximately 10,500 students. As a member of the University of Wisconsin system, wherein each school has become known for a particular strength, UWL is primarily known for their strength of programs in the health sciences and hard sciences. With such student populations gravitating towards UWL, it is typical that students appear in the humanities and social sciences primarily for their general education courses, and then move towards majors in those larger focus locations. With such populations on our campus, and the recognition that TPC did not inherit the kinds of success on this campus as it has on others, TPC specialists began to shift their thinking about the value, location, and connections for TPC on our campus and beyond.

Initially, prior to the hiring of the first TPC specialist in 2010, the instructors teaching professional and technical writing courses were an Early American Literature scholar, a Drama scholar, and a specialist in African-American literature. These were, of course, the most immediate stakeholders on campus: people who were teaching technical communication as hyperpragmatic, skills-only courses with outcomes grounded solely in textual production. Since 2010, we have added four TPC specialists to the mix: one in 2010, one in 2013, one in 2015, and one in 2019. Also since 2010, we have seen significant growth, from 20+ minors to more than 50, and we continue to serve non-minor students across the university as other majors and minors continue to add our courses to their lists of requirements. As we have grown, however, we have also shrunk. In 2017, we reduced the number of required credits for the minor from 21 to 18, and in 2018, we developed a 12-credit
undergraduate certificate program. The following sections detail how we got from there to here, weaving in some of the insights from TPC scholarship. We do not wish to suggest that we always consciously wove those insights into our program as we developed it, but rather, in taking stock of our programmatic development and our disciplinary concerns as TPC scholars, we realized how those concerns imprinted themselves on our plans as they developed, shaping our curriculum and our institutional alignments along the way.

Surveying the Field, Revising a Minor
One of the ways we sought to initially establish alliances and illustrate the rarity and value of TPC scholarship was through a stakeholder analysis for the minor. These stakeholders included our department, our College of Arts, Social Sciences, and the Humanities, and the students the minor served. We found, as in most situations, competing narratives about needs, wants, and goals. The department needed higher numbers and more structure, and stated that they wanted more field-knowledge and another member to teach writing and rhetoric major courses. However, the departmental wants also collided with departmental understandings of the place and function of professional and technical writing, as well as perceived competition for student numbers.

The college and university wanted higher enrollments; proof, in other words, that the first TPC specialist was worth the hire. Students in the minor wanted more substantial and diverse courses, and presented a need to understand the value of professional and technical communication to their majors and career goals, as well as a larger conception of knowledge production. As for Hire 1, she wanted to provide a framework that could represent the field as ethically as possible, a robust view of the driving concepts in professional and technical writing and opportunities to showcase student knowledge of those concepts. The only way she initially saw to do so was through the eventual development of a major, which is what her first revisions were also geared towards.

As Hire 1 was the only TPC specialist at our regional campus at that time, she had neither the time nor the ability to seek stakeholders outside her immediate context. In creating this structure, Hire 1’s aim was to illustrate and discuss this revision as one way to conceptualize and engage the varying conversations in the field of professional and technical writing. As one person, she could feasibly only add one or perhaps two new courses. Additionally, while some of the aforementioned stakeholders recognized the structure as one that provided more nuance for students, advisers, and faculty, in many other ways it
encouraged some, particularly faculty members, to continue to understand the TPC writing minor solely in terms of a skills-based understanding to the categories.

It was here the program stayed for several years, as Hire 1 continued to try to grow the minor, still with an eye towards a major, based solely on a more structured format, a more field-specific view of professional writing, on students’ word of mouth, and through a partnership with Career Services for the newly required internship component. It was that component, the connection with Career Services and internship sites, that revealed more stakeholders than what Hire 1 originally encountered. To address this burgeoning need, Hire 1 was more than overjoyed when UWL hired another TPC specialist in 2013.

**Building Alliances Beyond the University**

Upon joining UWL in 2013, one of Hire 2’s first steps was to broaden the stakeholder base by connecting with organizations off-campus who might provide a location to do some client-based service projects. Based on those course-based client service projects, in addition to existing and growing our internship locations, we realized there were some major stakeholder groups missing in our initial analysis: organizations outside of UWL who provide internships and sites of learning for our students, potential employers, non-minor students who were required to take our courses, departments who offer our courses as electives in their majors, and students who are taking the courses as university-required writing-emphasis courses. In particular, our internship and client service locations see use-value in the minor in ways that our institution, and our department specifically, has not yet been able to articulate.

Hire 2 also identified the need for a client-based class that focuses on content strategy, web writing, and user experience, culminating in the creation of a new course, ENG 310: Digital Content Writing, Strategy, and Experience Design. This course situates TPC not as a means to an end or a supplement to a larger organizational objective, but as central to an institution’s mission (Clark, 2016). This course, along with Hire 1’s ENG 314: Grant Writing, are situated primarily as client service project courses, where students connect TPC theory and practice during a semester-long project for a UWL or community client.

By expanding the client service and internship connections, Hire 2 also developed relationships with community partners who are more than willing to share their expertise with UWL students as part of a (now regular) TPC speaker series each semester. This not only strengthens connections between the university and community, but also provides a captive audience of up-and-coming professionals (UWL...
Building Alliances Across Disciplines

Our Professional and Technical Writing minor has grown into a major presence across campus partly because some of our core courses are passage points for many majors. Courses such as ENG 307: Writing for Management, Public Relations, and the Professions, ENG 310: Digital Content Writing, Strategy, and Experience Design, ENG 308: Technical Writing, and ENG 314: Grant Writing, function as requirements or electives within majors/minors across campus, including: Digital Media and Design Studies, Recreation Management, Pre-Vet, Legal Studies, Public Administration, Exercise and Sport Science, Military Science, and History. As such, these serve as useful sites of adhocratic collaboration for our students. They come together from various disciplinary backgrounds with various disciplinary specializations, and then they collaborate on projects, using various ICTs, seeing the project through to completion. When the project is over, they disperse. We implicitly and sometimes explicitly draw students’ attention in these courses to the fact that they are participating in an institutional adhocracy, and we emphasize all that entails: flexible, rotating leadership; communication across specializations; shifting divisions of labor. By obviating that fact and emphasizing the prevalence of adhocratic workplaces, we are able to draw students to the minor without resorting to hyperpragmatic skills-based appeals.

Recently, the medical schools at both UW-Madison and University of Minnesota have added an upper-division writing emphasis course as an admissions requirement. Some of our professional writing courses meet this requirement, and therefore expand the minor’s reach even further. For example, Recreation Management majors in the College of Science and Health are required to take ENG 307—major numbers in that location have varied in the last five years from 68-100, and those numbers are currently on an upward trend. Our 300-level classes are important sites to recruit students from a variety of majors to the minor, and we further expanded our stakeholder base with our third TPC specialist hire in 2015. His expertise in interdisciplinary scientific communication allows the minor to develop stronger relationships with the science community on our campus.

Soon after joining the English Department, Hire 3 met with faculty stakeholders in the sciences, who were interested in integrating writing instruction into their classes. Two challenges emerged from those discussions. First, their curriculum is packed and rigidly standardized, leaving little room or flexibility for integrating sustained, writing-intensive instruction. Second, many faculty members noted...
their students graduated without necessary technical communication skills to engage with general audiences. Noting our minor’s adaptability to students’ majors and our emphasis on accommodating technical knowledge ethnically for various audiences, Hire 3’s answer to both those concerns tended to be the same: send them to us in the Professional and Technical Writing minor.

But, of course, it’s not that simple. As part of our efforts to build relationships across campus, the three of us met with chairs and program directors from various departments to understand how we might coordinate to fit their needs and draw more students to the minor. Through these meetings, we learned that many students in the sciences choose minors that are close to the content area of their major. Many students majoring in biology, for example, tend to minor in chemistry. Similarly, many students majoring in finance tend to minor in accountancy. These interviews suggest that, while our colleagues are convinced that a professional and technical writing minor offers a kind of technical expertise that complements majors in their respective fields, students prioritize minors that pair content-wise with their chosen majors. Another problem we ran into during these discussions was that the 21 credit hours required to complete the minor are too many to be a viable choice for many majors that have an already-packed curricular load. We recognized that trimming the minor by 3 credit hours would go a long way toward aligning the minor with majors across the university, and the minor recently changed to require 18 credits for this very reason.

These discussions also led to the realization that a 12-credit certificate program would help us further build alliances between disciplines. This certificate was made available to students in fall 2018, and includes coursework that provides students with experience in project-oriented, multi-disciplinary settings where they work with newly emergent ICTs. We hope this certificate brings in a wide variety of students from majors across the university. Whereas one of the benefits of a major is working, semester-by-semester, alongside a stable cohort of like-minded students on similar academic and professional trajectories, we emphasize, in our coursework, the practical and humanistic values of collaborating across these traditional boundaries within rotating teams of specialists (or specialists-in-progress).

Ultimately, our minor has shrunk in some important ways: we have trimmed credit requirements from 21 to 18; we have added a 12-credit certificate option. But we have grown in significant ways, as well: our enrollment has doubled since 2010, which has allowed us to make arguments for new hires during a time when new tenure lines in the
English Department are difficult to come by. We have grown from one TPC specialist faculty member to three, and a fourth joined us in fall 2019. We also regularly partner with at least 20 community stakeholders through client service projects and internships each year. Crucially, our course caps have stayed the same, and we work diligently to keep them fixed at 18 students. We continuously calibrate around this constant number, adjusting course offerings and schedules each academic year.

**Conclusion, Next Steps, and Recommendations**

Taking time to reflect on our story and reanalyze the work of our Professional and Technical Writing minor, we discovered several things. First, the interdisciplinary nature of all of our professional and technical writing courses, by virtue of the populations who enroll, may provide tangible, logical sites to articulate value and substance to our undergraduate students who major in fields other than TPC. In other words, we are able to access individuals who might not otherwise have access to TPC inquiry and practice. We have found that, in turn, our students are doing grassroots advocacy about the use-value of professional and technical communication beyond product-based work.

Second, such work brings us into contact with other departments, administrators, and community partners. This interaction and connection allows us to promote the TPC minor in organic and intellectually-driven ways. Currently, we are in contact with many nonprofits and other organizations because, in part, of our campus outreach to other departments. For example, our colleague in biology connected us with community partners who are providing internship opportunities for TPC minors with science majors.

And third, we initially considered having a TPC major on our campus as a way to create a kind of academic legitimacy for the field, and for our work on this campus. Through this long-term stakeholder analysis exercise, we’ve come to find that our WID-esque approach to assignments, courses, and the structure of the minor offers us a kind of institutional location and connection that we are uncertain we would achieve with a more traditional major model. Indeed, we have found that, rather than expanding our curriculum into a major, scaling back our minor by trimming three credit hours helped further establish our interdisciplinary relationships. Staying minor, in other words, helps us remain a nimble, major presence across the University.

Our reflective case study here has allowed us to develop generative questions that may assist others in developing their own TPC programs in similar ways:

1. Who are the stakeholders and what are their needs, expectations,
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and parameters? Think about ways to build alliances with these stakeholders to communicate the value of TPC and create TPC advocacy networks.

- Internal stakeholders may include current students, faculty/staff, administration, home department, other departments, home college, other colleges, registrar, financial aid, career services, advising office, and so on.
- External stakeholders may include prospective students, regents/legislators (if state institution), board (if private institution), community partners, employers, alumni, and so on.

2. Who else is doing similar work? Consider your peer/aspirant institutions and local/regional/state institutions. This may be useful for determining how your program can stand out among other institutions, as well as for building TPC advocacy networks across institutions.

3. How can a program communicate its use-value to students? One way to communicate the flexibility of a TPC minor for students across the university is to develop a TPC speaker series and invite alumni and local professionals to talk about the work they do. Not only does this communicate the use-value of TPC to students, but it also demonstrates such value in a public way to other stakeholders (home department, college, and university). This is also a productive approach to also develop stronger ties to alumni and make connections to community partners.

4. How can a program extend teaching beyond the classroom? Advising and mentoring is a key part of a strong TPC program. We assign TPC specialists as advisors to all of our minors, even though advising on our campus is mostly the purview of major programs. Our approach to advising is one of rhetorical mentoring, where we work with students to help them achieve their individual academic and professional goals situated within institutional and societal contexts. Advising is a powerful location for building relationships with our key stakeholder group: students.

5. How can a program connect with community partners? One approach is to contact local nonprofits to identify clients for course-embedded client service projects. Another approach is to work with your institution’s career services office to connect with employers who want interns and might also work as course clients.

UW-La Crosse’s Technical and Professional Writing minor is becoming a major presence across the campus and community, and we owe that to our insistence on a flexible, adhocratic approach to curriculum...
design and community engagement. This approach responds to stakeholders’ needs while resisting hyperpragmatism in favor of a more critically and ethically engaged framework. We’ve also worked diligently to educate stakeholders about the work that TPC does and the value of that work. Often, TPC advocacy work has to begin in the home department.

The success of our Professional and Technical Writing minor in the community might not be unusual. According to Rentz, Debs, and Meloncon (2010), the shift towards cultural and civic engagement, a turn which the authors have anticipated for TPC, has created an “increasingly hospitable environment for our contributions” (p. 294). As we continue to develop relationships with community-based organizations, we are able to garner support and evidence for the framing of our minor beyond a service orientation. In turn, our university community and department are slowly beginning to foster the kind of environment our minor needs to thrive for all stakeholders. Our university-based stakeholders are beginning to understand the value of a TPC minor less within the confines of their relationship to TPC, but rather through our efforts to enact The Wisconsin Idea of extending “knowledge and its application beyond the boundaries of its campuses.”
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As longtime instructors of technical communication, we are proponents of collaborative learning, and we strive to create assignments that replicate real-world outcomes as our students design and produce deliverables for targeted users. A typical process for our students might involve working with clients and creating communications to meet specific needs. For the last few years, we’ve been lucky to have access to computer-based classrooms for our TPC courses (we created one of these computer classrooms specifically for TPC students). Yet despite the advances we made in building our classrooms into valuable working spaces for our students, we were not completely satisfied with the way the classroom spaces supported collaboration and productivity. Specifically, we found each space limiting: a few students might group at one computer screen, assist each other to use software, or clarify problems they encounter. But individuals were still sitting behind neatly aligned screens, looking up only occasionally to see if they were “doing it right.” The computer classroom had benefits, but no matter how we tried to replicate a creative space and locate students outside of the traditional academic space, we remained in a classroom that supported and generated classroom behaviors. Rather than seeking alternatives to the classroom, we developed a complement to it: a productive learning space.

In this article, we share the successes we experienced and the lessons we learned when theorizing, planning, and operating a productive learning space. Our space, named the Iris Technical-Communication Suite (Iris), took two-and-a-half years to create—from early discussions among faculty, to conversations with upper admin-
Building Productive Spaces

Administrators, to initial funding, and finally to opening our space for student use. As more institutions ramp up their efforts to create similar spaces, we see an opportunity to share our experiences and learned lessons (sometimes the hard way) with instructors who, like us, may find themselves building the case for such a space or—even better—creating one for their own TPC programs. This article functions on several levels because we recognize that readers may encounter it at varying points in their quests to create their own productive spaces. Specifically, we explore these areas:

- Theorizing the need for the space and building an argument for it.
- Planning how to effectively use funds and to avoid mistakes when spending.
- Building a brand and publicizing it.

We cannot claim, nor do we attempt, to account for all of the nuances involved in creating productive learning spaces; instead, what we offer is a collection of information that we have frequently found ourselves trying to share with people who contact us for more information or who speak with us during Q&A sessions at conferences. Too many times, we have found ourselves with only a few minutes in a crowded hallway, trying to answer the many questions that people have when embarking on this journey. As we learned in our own experiences, and as we have observed anecdotally from speaking with others, faculty are frequently underprepared for the hurdles that they experience not just in trying to gain permission to create a productive space, but in trying to build it, deliver it under budget, and keep it on task. We invite readers to interact with this article in the order that suits them best, and we welcome further questions.

Theorizing a Space

Today’s students in technical and professional communication are called upon to use the “rhetorical tools of graphic designers, illustrators, photographers, and videographers in order to assume responsibility for the[ir] production of culture” (Sheridan, Ridolfo, Michel, 2012, p. xii); therefore, getting these tools into the hands of our budding rhetors becomes a primary responsibility as our programs seek to engage students in discovering the available means of persuasion and embrace the transformative learning possibilities that a production space can invite (Lerner, 2009). As Stuart Selber presciently argued in his contribution to Foundations for Teaching Technical Communication (1997), today’s students cannot be passive operators, but must overcome design decisions encouraged or discouraged by any one technology (194). In sharing our experiences, our goal is to help faculty
overcome the complications of creating a productive space where students can use a variety of tools to remediate rhetorical delivery. Twenty-first century composing practices must now consider the “idiomatic elements of a particular medium, the manipulation of those elements within a particular medium, or the paratextual or extra-textual features of a given text” (McCorkle, 2012, p. 13). Traditional concepts of the rhetorical canons of invention and delivery need to be reimagined because the creative practices we invite students to explore include manipulating texts in new ways. What’s more, “the spatial turn in the disciplines of technical communication and rhetoric and writing studies...affirm that where communicative practices happen is just as important as how and why they happen” (Hurley, 2018, p. 96).

**Action Research**

In *A Research Primer for Technical Communication*, George Hayhoe and Pam Estes Brewer (2020) liken research in technical communication to that of engineering, where theories are applied to solve problems. An earlier edition of that text, co-authored by Michael Hughes and George Hayhoe (2008), argued that “research in technical communication is not an activity conducted in a vacuum; it is generally initiated by a problem or a need to understand a phenomenon related to technical communication” (p. 5). Thus, the concept of productive spaces described in this article follows from action research where “a researcher works with a group to define a problem, collects data to determine whether or not this is indeed the problem, and then experiments with protentional solutions to the problem” (Watkins and Brooks, 1994, as cited in Hughes and Hayhoe, 2008, p. 4). When we searched for discussions of ways traditional computer classrooms might be negatively stoking behaviors of our budding rhetors, we found Robert A. Ellis and Peter Goodyear (2016) whose review of learning-space research helped us make connections between space, place, and learning. Eventually that led to our being able to map the plan for our experiment, the productive space, Iris.

**A Different Type of Space**

Universities have long recognized that space is needed for students to conduct their business, and most have generously provided computer classrooms and open labs for students. That said, access to technology is not enough. Cell phones might have the power to make readily available many of the things that used to be technologically and economically off-limits to writing assignments, but innovation is less a matter of figuring ways to employ technology in teaching pedagogies and more of a desire to supply locations for students to create. They need a space
that moves the teacher and the technologies to facilitator roles and allows students to reimagine their roles as communication creators.

**Productive learning.** In the early days of the internet, *Science* magazine argued that the essence of a “collaboratory” is not a physical tool but the “software that enables scholars to use remote libraries, collaborate with remote colleagues, interact with remote instruments, and analyze data with test models…” (Wulf, 1993, p. 854). Nearly thirty years later, technical-writing instructors have come to recognize that the internet’s ability to bring groups together can also keep people apart and unable to collaborate fully; thus, we suggest that a professional, collaborative space must be a place that combines the opportunities of the internet’s digital spaces with technologies located in physical spaces and with the humans who inhabit those spaces—in other words, productive spaces.

We term our learning space as *productive* because doing so is the most direct way to describe one of the environments in which we want our students to work. Our use of this term draws upon Ingrid Böhm, Jens Schneider, and Joseph Alsina’s (1996) development of *Productive Learning* (PL), and we acknowledge the overlap between our goals for TPC students and those disseminated through the Institute for Productive Learning in Europe (IPLE). According to IPLE, PL creates a “practical orientation,” in which students spend three days of their week learning in “real situations of everyday life” and the other two days learning in a study workshop at school (Böhm & Schneider, 2006). Learning is meant to be the result of combining theory, experience, and mentoring in both the workplace and the classroom. We recognize the importance of PL and the successes that its creators have had in European schools; nonetheless, we find that Böhm and Schneider’s PL is a broad model for education that dwarfs our goal of creating a learning environment where our students could be, literally, productive. Additionally, PL privileges the workplace, an act that Ryan Moeller and Ken McAllister (2002) find problematic. As outlined in their assessment of *techne* in our classrooms, Moeller and McAllister have three hopes for us to achieve:

- To inspire technical communicators to think in creative ways that do not rely on corporate terminology or workplace analogies.
- To provide teachers of technical communication with a new focus that can be used playfully in the classroom.
- To inspire teachers to think of themselves as teachers, not as bosses or representatives of the real world. (2002, p. 188).

In our view, *productive* is the convergence of theory, student-led
exploration, and *techne*. Most importantly, *productive* is not meant as an antonym to *counterproductive*, which could be seen as a pejorative implying that learning spaces unlike ours somehow thwart the intended outcomes that instructors bring into—and achieve in—their varied classrooms. For us, the productive learning space fills a void left by terms that are already used to describe similar, yet different, types of learning spaces (e.g., usability labs, active learning spaces, collaboratories, writing labs, etc.).

A Progression from Usability Labs to Productive Spaces

Examples of productive learning spaces in TPC programs are scarce, so we lack a framework to illustrate how they might develop; however, when we consider the history of a close cousin, the usability lab, we see how the productive learning space has developed and why it is poised to fulfill the needs of our programs.

**Usability spaces in TPC programs.** In the late 90s and early 2000s, dedicated usability spaces and tools—especially usability labs—were symbols of cutting-edge technical communication pedagogy. The field began embracing usability more as a core concept rather than an elective skill, and soon after, usability labs began appearing in TPC programs. Not coincidentally, the user experience (UX) became paramount to products of technical communication. Robert Johnson (1998) details the user-centeredness inherent to all mundane tasks and the need for such an approach in our interactions with new and developing technologies. Many universities spent the 1990s modernizing classroom technologies, and computer-based classrooms became a vital component of the technical communication learning experience. Additionally, the democratizing effect of affordable personal computing and individual access to the internet made the requisite tools for usability more readily available for students, faculty, and programs. As such, Lee-Ann Breuch, Mark Zachry, and Clay Spinuzzi (2001) encouraged programs to develop usability facilities and laboratories if funds were available. At the time of their article’s publication, two of the authors’ institutions (Texas Tech University and Utah State University) had recently developed (or were in the process of developing) industry-grade usability labs for their programs in technical communication.

**UX in TPC programs.** The UX emphasis in technical communication continued to expand throughout the 2000s and early 2010s. Robert Johnson, Michael Salvo, and Meredith Zoetewey (2007) called for programs in technical communication to lead a cultural shift toward user-centered methodology. The effect of the field’s focus on UX can be seen in two studies about curricula in technical communication.
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conducted nearly ten years apart. In 2005, Sandi Harner and Anne Rich found that only 1% of programs in technical communication required a usability course. By 2013, Lisa Melonçon and Sally Henschel’s study determined that the number of required usability courses had risen to 11%. Tharon Howard (2015) writes about how he, in 1993, built one of the field’s first usability labs at Clemson, ahead of the larger discipline’s shift towards usability. As the shift to greater focus on usability transpired, some of the larger programs at the time—like TTU and USU—built usability labs based on professional facilities described by leading practitioners (Dumas & Redish, 1993; Rubin, 1994, as qtd. in Breuch, Zachry, and Spinuzzi, 2001). Smaller programs, though, could not build such facilities because of the associated costs and the rather limited uses for dedicated usability labs. Despite the functionality that larger programs might have in a usability lab, a collection of computers networked between two rooms with a one-way mirror separating them just doesn’t lend itself well to everyday student interaction. Thus, the concept of a usability lab becomes a springboard towards developing more functional productive spaces for students studying technical communication.

**Productive spaces in TPC programs.** UX and technical communication evolved throughout the 2010s and outgrew the methodological limitations of the usability lab (Howard, 2015). In his reflection on building and running usability labs, Howard (2015) ultimately encourages programs to look at collaboration spaces rather than traditional labs because they offer greater “methodological flexibility” (149), allowing students to conduct UX research at every stage of the product-development cycle. Iris embraces Howard’s call for a move to collaboration spaces, but also integrates a wide range of TPC tools and resources within it (from printing equipment to a sound booth to a collaborative meeting space). Iris complements the classroom by providing students a single productive location for all TPC projects. Additionally, faculty have access to a productive space—beyond the traditional classroom—that provides Howard’s envisioned methodological flexibility and ultimately greater pedagogical flexibility.

In the following sections, we detail our specific experiences making the case for Iris and building and managing it. In sharing our experiences, we hope to provide other TPC programs with insights to encourage their own reimagining of productive spaces. Having theorized the need for productive spaces, we now make a deliberative move to provide information in much the same style we would if we were speaking face-to-face. From here on, we adopt a more conversational style and talk directly to you, the reader. Again, one goal of our work is...
Making the Case

Making the case for the productive space is no small task. Not only does the space require a significant amount of financial and technological resources, but it draws on other assets of the academic landscape including space, personnel, and continued administrative support. A room containing computers, technology, and students at work seems like a “computer lab,” and this ambiguity can work against those arguing for a productive space. Most universities have a good number of computer labs, but their purposes are limited to those of everyday utility: accessing the internet, using university-licensed software, and printing documents for assignments. We spent many hours explaining what we were hoping to create and how it would be different from what is available elsewhere on our campus. The traditional computer lab seems especially useful and easy to justify, yet it has not been relegated to the status of “just another room” on campus. Labs are expensive to maintain and frequently viewed as privileges when faculty are booking course locations. At the same time, students have unprecedented access to tools for producing documents on their smartphones (think Google Docs, Adobe’s suite of apps, iMovie, etc.). Granted, the phone is not a feasible replacement for all modes of digital production, but it can get a lot done; accordingly, someone who is requesting a productive space should be prepared for an administrator to argue that students can complete many productive tasks in existing labs or with their personal technologies. Through the iterative process of making our case for a productive space, we realized that the technology is an important component, but it is only part of a greater whole. As instructors of technical communication, we must interrogate our own notions of workspaces so that we can avoid imposing limitations on our students’ possibilities and effectively prepare them for the dynamic, globalized workplaces they will enter.

Articulating What’s Missing

Though our productive space was built in a relatively short period of time, with planning taking about a year and a half and the allocation and spending of funds happening within one academic year, the process of arguing for the space happened, unwittingly, over the better part of a decade. For nearly 10 years, we found ourselves wishing for a space that could bridge the gap between our professional and pedagogical workspaces. And though we frequently lamented about what
we lacked, we could not always reduce our desires to definitive talking points when we had audiences with administration at our university. In hindsight, we can now see the threads that were woven through our discussions and arguments with administration, and we have sought to organize what we did into a heuristic that others can use to guide their deliberations and planning.

In an effort to help identify what is available (and what is not) in a program’s learning spaces, we devised a heuristic adapted from Victoria O’Donnell’s (2005) methodology for visual cultural analysis. In the same way that O’Donnell digs beneath the surface of an image by understanding its implications and possibilities, we explore implications and possibilities of an instructional space. This methodology allows a richer analysis, which is essential for those who are arguing for productive spaces. As useful as O’Donnell’s methodology is, we concede that it was originally devised for assessing images, films, and other visuals, which can require more unpacking than a static space; accordingly, we distilled her methodology into a portable heuristic, which highlights offerings in available learning spaces while, more importantly, drawing attention to gaps and deficiencies in those same environments:

1. What is present?
2. What is absent?
3. Is the distribution of technology homogenous in the space?
4. What is the dominant mode of learning or doing in the space?
5. Can we place ourselves in the space, identifying with it as technical communicators who are striving to produce?

When using the heuristic, you should answer the questions on multiple levels (possibly in multiple passes). For example, answering question 1 (What is present?), you should quantify tangible features of the space, such as seating, chairs, window coverings, computers, etc. In a second pass, note the quality of the items. Just because a room has computers doesn’t mean they are up to date or usefully arranged. Similarly, a room stocked with once-expensive, yet too-large, chairs may be overly cluttered and visibly dated. As we discuss later, budgets are important, and not everything needs to be purchased new for a productive space to be effective; nonetheless, the space is about more than just having certain features. The features need to combine to create a positive experience for students and, hopefully, contribute to an air of satisfaction in using the space. Recalling Donald Norman’s Emotional Design (2004), we encourage you to strive for balance between behavioral, visceral, and reflective design in your space.
Finding and Using the Money

For many, the most significant obstacle to overcome when building a productive space is finding the money. You might be arguing for support at an institution that has been struggling financially or in a department that is seeing decreasing enrollment. In either situation, asking your administration for a large financial commitment may feel uncomfortable; however, your administration may have a vested interest in funding your space. Our college dean was accommodating in earmarking funds from the Higher Education Assistance Funds (HEAF), available through our state. These funds do come with expenditure procedures and restrictions but allow us to invest in capital equipment and tangible assets. Contrary to our initial beliefs, obtaining the money was easier than managing the process of spending it. People from across your institution will be watching, so you want to ensure that your request for money—and ultimate management of it—is as informed as possible. Financial missteps can make or break a project such as this one, so our goal in this section is to ensure that you have as much information as possible to guide your decisions.

Spend Your Money

Spending money can quickly become less about what you buy and more about how you buy. In the following paragraphs, we draw from our experiences to help you spend your money as successfully as possible.

Prepare for the details. Money allows you to acquire the things you need, but you will likely be responsible for articulating every aspect of that need. For example, something as simple as a chair can involve customization of a dozen variables—from the types and colors of fabrics (for both the seat and the back) to the density of rubber for the wheels. The process of making these decisions can be overwhelming, so we recommend that you devote time to learning about what exists on your campus and why. That is, walk through the classrooms in various buildings. You’ll likely see a variety of desks, podiums, and technologies. Avoid the temptation to automatically replicate what you see. The presence of one type of chair in many classrooms may represent one purchaser’s preference or a vendor’s success in pushing a product that might not work for you. When you have money to spend, you’ll discover that no turn-key approach to spending exists. If you want desks, you’ll likely be given a catalog of dozens of options, each with dozens of customizations. We kept waiting for someone to materialize who would translate our brainstorms into tangible materials. Eventually, we realized that this role didn’t exist; we had to be that
someone—and quickly before the availability of our funds expired. Before you begin spending, you might explore which things should be purchased as new and which might be repurposed from your institution’s existing materials. Even with our budget of $85,000, we knew we would not be able to acquire everything new. By making regular visits to our university’s property warehouse (where furniture goes after being removed from other campus facilities), we were able to find high-quality pieces that suited our needs and spared our budgets for items that couldn’t be second hand. Our most significant find in the used department is a collection of large, round tables that were wired for power. Aside from having power outlets, the tables are low-tech. But their generous sizes provide the perfect spaces for students to sit, talk, and solve communication issues. Just as importantly, these tables serve as a rhetorical device, visually declaring the space as different from the everyday computer lab.

**Learn the rules of your funding.** In addition to knowing the items that you should purchase, you must understand which items you are allowed to purchase—and when. For example, the nature of our funding required that each item have a minimum retail price of $200. We first faced this issue when trying to buy iPad Pros. Each iPad exceeded the $200 minimum, but the covers and Pencils (stylus) did not. Because Apple sells these ancillary items individually, we were initially unable to get them—that is until we discovered that one of our vendors bundled iPads with cases and Pencils into one “item” with a single SKU. Though the solution was simple, and waiting for us all along, we didn’t know that items could be bundled in this way, and only while looking for unrelated items on a vendor’s site did we discover this workaround. We also found that some vendors will even build special bundles if the items are logically/usefully related (think digital camera, tripod, and carrying case), so you might be able to solve any minimum-price issues by picking up the phone and asking.

**Know (and save) the dates for spending money.** Another important aspect of using your money is actually being able to spend it. Having ordered computers and other office hardware from our IT department in the past, we were aware of the deadline for submitting purchase requests ahead of the end of our fiscal year. In early spring, we ordered all of our hardware to avoid running into the summer rush that frequently pushes last-minute requests into next year’s budget. But we did not consider that the other divisions from which we would be securing goods and services had due dates outside of the fiscal calendar. The classroom that we were transforming had a floor covered
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with the institutional linoleum that is common in older buildings on our campus (Figure 1). We wanted to have carpeting, and we knew that we would need to make our request for carpeting ahead of the end of the fiscal year; however, we didn’t know that we had to request a bid from our own facilities department before we could make our order. Even worse, we didn’t realize that the facilities department’s internal deadline for requesting a bid had already passed. Our lack of understanding the process left us in a bind. In the next section, we describe how we solved this issue.

Figure 1. The classroom that was remediated into our productive space

**Have a backup plan.** The highest-level advice that we could share with someone who is building a productive space is to be prepared to solve problems. As we mentioned earlier, we missed an important deadline for requesting an estimate to carpet the room. We felt strongly about having carpet: it would absorb sound when the space was filled with working students; it would create a demarcation between our space and the everyday classrooms surrounding it; and it would make the space look nicer. Because we would be installing furniture that could not be moved (such as our 2000-pound sound booth; see Figure 4), we had to get the carpet in as soon as possible. In a scramble to find a solution, we looked for rugs or similar items that our approved vendors sold, but nothing was available. After discussing the is-
sues with people who were helping us order materials, we learned that we could add new vendors to the system as long as they were willing to go through the university’s vetting process. This option allowed us to explore creative versions of carpet, and we found an excellent carpet-tile product that embodied the image we were building for our space and that offered the flexibility of swapping out tiles should they become damaged or stained over time. Best of all, the product was technically an area rug, so we did not need to go through our facilities department for estimates or installation. Figure 2 shows the rug installation while in progress, and Figure 3 reveals the finished product.

**Figure 2. Installation of the carpeting in Iris**

![Figure 2](image2.jpg)

**Figure 3. Collaboration desks and carpeting, installed**

![Figure 3](image3.jpg)
Hunt for bargains—but don't be cheap. Effective and ethical stewardship of your institution’s funds requires that you shop for bargains—especially for popular items, such as paper, printer toner, etc. Items such as brand-name computers or software require less research because they have rigid MSRP's. But you will also be purchasing equipment that comes in many versions and that is available from a number of competitive retailers. For example, if you are trying to buy tripods for cameras, you will discover many brands that offer similarly equipped models across a spectrum of price points. We recommend taking time to research each one, ask an expert on campus, or even call the vendor to speak with a knowledgeable salesperson. Sometimes a more expensive option is pricier for good reason, so don’t be afraid to go with something – even if it isn’t the “best deal.”

Learn the letter of law. Finally, take time to explore and understand the institutional/legal policies that might prevent your acquiring goods that you desire. We learned this lesson when trying to purchase our sound booth (see Figure 4). After conducting research, we narrowed our options to two booths; each was from a different manufacturer, and one was more expensive. We preferred the pricier option, but the cheaper one was still good and would save us $2,000, so we went with the less expensive booth. As we prepared our order, we submitted the vendor’s paperwork for university approval. The company, based in another state, provided their terms and conditions, which required that we arbitrate disputes in their state; however, our university’s legal counsel required that vendors arbitrate in Texas. We explained this issue to the vendor, but they were not willing to change their terms. Ironically, our efforts to save money resulted in our having to spend more. The upside was that we ended up with the booth that we originally wanted.
Starting Up Your Productive Space

In the first part of this article, we theorized the productive space and discussed how to acquire support for it. In this section, we offer recommendations regarding starting up and operating your productive space based on our experiences. After building your productive space, you need to turn your attention to branding and everyday operation, including staffing the space and solving operational problems.

Brand Your Space

In the midst of securing funds, purchasing equipment, and configuring your space, you should also consider how you will brand it. Your institution likely has various arms for branding and marketing new initiatives, but your productive space might be left for you to name, brand, and market; after all, it is not a new program, a fundraising initiative, or a recruitment tool. Your space will need not just a name and logo but also signs and other documents that identify it and help students use it. For Iris, we played off the colors in our carpeting and created an assortment of signs to indicate the different stations and equipment available (see Figure 5). We also went through an iterative process for choosing the name and designing a logo and corresponding sign. Figure 6 encapsulates some of the designs and names that we considered when branding Iris. Beginning with names that described what might happen in the space or what students might create, we ultimately gave agency for our space by naming it Iris, a messenger of the Greek gods.
Iris was the rainbow personified, so we incorporated the primary color spectrum into the logo design.

Figure 5. Signs created to identify equipment stations
After we received support and finished building the space, we hosted an open house. Members of various academic departments and institutional divisions from across the university visited Iris. The open house showed off the space to potential collaborators, and our university’s news service published articles about it. Just as importantly, administrators with additional funds and resources expressed interest in helping us maintain/stock the space. The thought of seeking support from people outside of our department and college hadn’t occurred to us, and this opportunity of generosity wouldn’t have presented itself unless we’d invited everyone over for some cake and collegiality.

**Staff your Space**
We appointed an official faculty director to manage staffing and technology, liaise with department and college administration, and coordinate with users and potential partners. A director or coordinator gives your productive space an institutional face who can network with
university personnel. Additionally, staff members may find it easier to report to one supervisor rather than many. Once your space is staffed, think about the hours you want to hold and how you want your staff to operate. We try to be open when technical-communication courses are taught, typically 9 a.m.–5 p.m., but sometimes we operate beyond traditional hours. For us, Iris exists to give students a space to explore their assignments and produce their work. We try to stress to our faculty that staff members are not technology tutors; they give students access to the tools, but instructors (and savvy students) teach students how to use the tools. To meet our staffing needs, our department assigned several graduate assistants and an undergraduate from the university’s work-study program. Our department did not have to take on additional financial responsibilities in staffing Iris. When staffing your own productive space, look for these opportunities, whether you offer your graduate assistants a new opportunity to gain experience or fill your needs through the federally funded work-study program administered through your institution.

Finally, give your staff agency. We appointed one of our graduate assistants as the Assistant Director of Iris. We made this appointment for two reasons: to acknowledge the hard work of this staff member and to give the space a staff-level manager who would operate the space daily. The Assistant Director has an official title and management responsibilities, giving her a line for her résumé and an experience she can discuss in job interviews.

**Train your staff.** Hold training sessions for your staff each semester. We hold these meetings during the first two weeks of the semester, when Iris is closed. These sessions last only a couple of hours each of these weeks. We hold team icebreakers, review workplace procedures, test equipment, and review staff projects. Training your staff in customer service is time well spent. Your staff is the face of your productive space, and you want your users to have positive experiences using the space. Encourage your staff to greet each user warmly and ask how they can help. These actions generate goodwill with your users.

**Create workplace documentation to manage work.** We often teach our students about the importance of workplace documentation to standardize operating procedures for employees. No matter the best of intentions, staff and faculty can (and do) make mistakes. Documenting workplace standards can help mitigate many of these mistakes. Table 1 shows the workplace documentation we created for Iris. One way to give your staff agency is assigning them to create the very documents that control practices in their workplace. Staff members
often have downtime during shifts, so assigning staff projects keeps them on task while also generating necessary workplace documentation. Additionally, staff members are the ones in the productive spaces a majority of the time and understand better than anyone what users need from these documents. Early on, the Iris staff created documents to manage the workplace efficiently (see Table 1). We have recently migrated versions of these documents into a staff-shared team in Microsoft Teams.

### Table 1. Documents Created to Solve Workplace Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff members have dynamic schedules and life constraints.</td>
<td>Staff schedule</td>
<td>Adjusts every three weeks to meet staffing needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution does not assign certain keys to graduate assistants.</td>
<td>Key tracking</td>
<td>Records when the key is checked in or out and by whom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space needs to be presentable at all times.</td>
<td>Daily task list</td>
<td>Records daily and weekly tasks, such as vacuuming, dusting, wiping tabletops, and checking supplies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users need guidance on discussing Iris in documents and using logos.</td>
<td>Style guide</td>
<td>Instructs users on acceptable ways to write about Iris and use its logos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer-produced manuals are too dense and complex for student users.</td>
<td>Instruction manual for each tool</td>
<td>Helps users quickly set up and start using commonly used tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure how often new supplies need to be ordered and where certain supplies are stored.</td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>Tracks profit and loss for resources and lists location for every item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Let experts help you solve problems.** Once you gain financial support from your department, dean, and other stakeholders to create your productive space, you cannot simply order the equipment, plug it in, and hang an “Open” sign in the door. Instead, you have to navigate an institutional maze to secure the support you need to operate efficiently. Though the thought of dealing with additional support divisions may seem cumbersome, doing so can make your work much easier. In short, let experts do their jobs.

Because our productive space was designed for students who study technical communication, we needed to limit access to the space and track which students were using it for which courses. Though the
empty space appeared intimate and easy to manage, we found that it could become busy quickly (see Figure 7), so we needed an efficient method of checking students into the space and tracking the tools that they were using.

**Figure 7. Students working in Iris**

To achieve this level of control, we worked with the project coordinator of our advising system, Campus Connect. At no cost to us, we were able to have a card scanner installed and an interface built that allowed us to associate incoming students with faculty members and their assigned projects. This example is but one of many instances in which we relied on the experts at our institution to help us operate our space. Table 2 shows the solutions that experts from IT and Academic Affairs (via our Campus Connect tool) contributed to our productive space. As Table 2 reveals, we collect data to help us further justify our productive space to administration. We present evidence to our administration to prove that their investment in our productive space is paying off. We also send semester reports to the dean, department chair, and Executive Vice President of IT that show the number of students using Iris, the tools most often used, and the time spent in the space. These reports are not mandatory but serve important rhetorical purposes: they justify the initial argument for the space, provide administrators with data to share in their reports to stakeholders, and
help us make cases for increased support.

**Table 2. Tasks Better Left to Experts When Starting Up Your Productive Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website for the space</td>
<td>IT web designer</td>
<td>Created a site quickly while the staff produced copy and images for each web page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email account</td>
<td>IT help desk</td>
<td>Created an email account for Iris that establishes a professional institutional identity and links to a print queue and appointment book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email permissions</td>
<td>IT help desk</td>
<td>Assigned permissions to staff. Director and assistant director can receive and send emails while other staff have “Read Only” permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online print queue</td>
<td>IT web designer</td>
<td>Linked our website to an Iris Dropbox Form to give students an accessible method for printing without having open access to Iris printers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online appointment book</td>
<td>IT web designer</td>
<td>Linked the Iris website to a free appointment system that we control and that students can access 24/7 to book appointments for the sound booth and photography stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card-swipe for student access</td>
<td>IT technician</td>
<td>Installed a card-swipe machine that allows us to verify whether students are authorized to use Iris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising software</td>
<td>Campus Connect project coordinator</td>
<td>Connected a card-swipe machine to the advising software kiosk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Campus Connect Project coordinator</td>
<td>Set data-collection parameters to identify users, reasons for accessing Iris, and duration of visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising kiosk permissions</td>
<td>Campus Connect project coordinator</td>
<td>Assigned system permissions to staff members. Director and assistant director have full reporting access while other staff can only access the sign-in system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our university’s IT department and the administrator of our Campus Connect software made work easier than it would have been had we tried to solve problems ourselves. They did the research and produced the tools we needed to operate our productive space efficiently. As mentioned above, let the experts do their jobs. Don’t toil away for weeks trying to solve a problem; instead, submit a ticket for it.

After you have branded your space, accounted for your staffing needs, established processes to manage the workplace, and asked the
experts at your institution to help you solve problems, you will finally be ready to do what set you off on this path at the beginning: opening the doors of your productive space to your students. Once students have access to the space to collaborate with each other, faculty, and technology, the possibilities for using your productive space to support course objectives are limited only to your own creativity.

**Final Thoughts**

We have observed remarkable interactions between students working in Iris, and those interactions are often independent of the technology in the room. In closing, and as a final reflection, we return to our heuristic based on O’Donnell’s methodology for cultural analysis. Viewing a completed space with the same heuristic, but a different lens, allows the creators of a space to move beyond counting “things” in the room and begin assessing the productive quality of the finished space.

1. **What is present?** What’s present is the “feeling” of creativity and collaboration—the ability of students to take the lead in creating their materials. There’s a more egalitarian notion among participants no matter their role in the space. The lack of a physical reminder of the student being the recipient of the learning and the teacher being the fountain of knowledge helps students to envision the space as a support for their ideas, rather than as a way to form their ideas.

2. **What is absent?** What is largely absent is the traditional classroom focus on teachers as authority figures. Gone is the classroom hierarchy with the teacher’s desk at the front and the students’ desks neatly aligned to receive the teacher’s knowledge; instead, we find open collaboration desks, brainstorming spaces, and spaces to interact with technology that invite students to behave differently in the space. The space still controls behaviors, but the control is loose, inviting, creative. This fluidity is what is lacking in a traditional computer classroom.

3. **Is the distribution of technology homogenous in the space?** No. Rather than having the room peppered with an even distribution of computers, the space is organized with technologies ranging from binding machines to photography equipment to computers. Placing computers along the back wall suggests that they are not the main focus; instead, students enter to see the collaborative and creative spaces. The technology is prominent yet organized loosely by mode or general task (e.g., photography stations, print production, or audio recording).
4. **What is the dominant mode of learning or doing in the space?**
   This is an active space, somewhat analogous to makerspaces (Maker Media). It’s a place of seeing communication ideas come to fruition and of creations taking specific actions. The students’ actions drive the design, becoming the exigence, rather than the exigence coming from traditional writing assignments. This learning mode also allows students to see the connection between technical communication and problem solving.

5. **Can we place ourselves in the space, identifying with it as technical communicators who are striving to produce?** Surely the goal of producing something (a deliverable of some sort) is there, but the process is what gets highlighted when you are in the physical space and can interact within the space. The physical space does not denote a hierarchy of thought or of people; thus, the space allows for creative solutions and collaboration to be normalized.

   A productive space requires sophisticated solutions to start it up and operate it efficiently; however, once you put into place the necessary pieces, you can focus on the best ways to use your productive space to meet the needs of your student and faculty users. Providing equipment and space, identifying a communication problem, and asking students to solve a problem should be an opportunity for distinctive solutions. When options for approaching problems abound and when solutions exceed traditional delivery modes, we allow students to linger in those productive, *kairotic* moments that lead to innovation and learning.
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Abstract. Technical and Professional Communication teachers and scholars must be iterative and responsive in revising curriculum if we hope to sustainably and innovatively reflect the direction of the field, consider the needs of various stakeholders like students and faculty, and be proactive to revise curriculum in ways that reflect the shared values of our field, versus merely responding in less meaningful ways to ever-increasing calls for accountability and assessment. We present a framework for revising curriculum that prioritizes identifying key pressures and human and non-human stakeholders, as well as urges sustainable strategies for piloting, supporting, and assessing new curriculum. This framework supports a proactive and sustainable approach to curriculum design, rather than a reactive approach.

Keywords: curriculum revision, pressures for change, program design, program sustainability

As teachers and researchers, what do we do when we begin to identify disjunctures between current curricula and broader trends in our field’s research, values, and professional communities? When we decide that the outcomes our curricula are based upon must change to address these disjunctures, what does it mean for a curriculum to be iteratively and dynamically responsive?
In response to these questions, this article presents a framework for building dynamically responsive curriculum that is reflective of the values of TPC and considerate of student and other stakeholder needs. We first present this framework and then use a case study to illustrate how dynamically responsive curriculum design can work, focusing on revisions made to a foundational Digital Writing and Rhetoric course in our university’s Professional Writing program.

One of the main goals of sharing our process is to show how curriculum can be dynamic in a responsive way rather than in a reactive way. Revising curriculum in a reactive manner risks opening our curricula to the growing corporatization of academic programs through neoliberal efficiency and accountability regimes. This is especially true for programs with ties to content deemed technical or business-related, such as Professional Writing programs, where we also want to maintain values reflective of ethical and humanistic traditions of writing, rhetoric, and communication. For instance, while we believe that our curriculum must be reflective of the emerging technologies that students will inevitably be required to use in their workplaces and communities when they leave the university, we also do not see our curriculum as serving students only for the purpose of “getting a job.” Instead, we also value the particular ethical and humanistic commitments present in the ways we teach students to use and critique emerging technologies and be aware of the potential impacts of such technologies.

Our field has a history of aligning itself with vertical curricular design—developing progressively sequenced curriculum that builds towards more complex learning—and research on how learning works broadly (Crowley 1998; Hall, 2006; Miles et al; 2008; Jamieson, 2009; Ambrose, Bridges, Lovett, DiPietro, & Norman, 2010; Melzer, 2014; Morris, 2017). We’re not posing dynamically responsive curricular design in opposition to vertical design, but instead as a framework for recognizing the need for curricular revision, which we’ve found to be a largely under-researched topic in the field. In other words, dynamically responsive curricular design highlights the factors that we should be iteratively attentive towards as we make programmatic changes. We offer that a responsive and reflective curriculum is one that is assessed iteratively and that takes into account human and non-human factors like student needs and student learning across the university; broader shifts in research and in workplace expectations; emerging technologies; etc. A reactive curriculum is one in which curriculum is not reflected upon iteratively, causing change-making and redesign to become forced creations to growing outside pressures, such as austerity measures in response to low enrollment, budget cuts, and other issues
related to economic shortfalls. We believe a proactive, reflective, and responsive curriculum that is based on empirical evidence, sustainability, and shared values is best for all stakeholders, versus a reactive one that makes changes only when forced, as such changes are often on terms that do not optimally benefit students or other stakeholders. In this article, we examine an ecology of curriculum development and program maintenance as we trace the redesign of a Professional Writing major's core course, Digital Rhetoric, within the larger revision of a major's learning outcomes and program assessment. While the case study we detail is specific to our institution, we see the framework for identifying human and non-human stakeholders involved in the redesign as portable for mapping responsive curriculum redesign in other Professional and Technical Writing Programs.

Careful curriculum revision and design is long and hard work that requires buy-in from various institutional stakeholders (human and non-human), attention to historical and emerging trajectories, and many hours on the part of those who undertake the revisions. One of the things we want to point out about our example is that it is a revision of one course within the context of revised program outcomes—not an entire program. We believe taking our time with curriculum revision is a necessary part of being iterative and reflective in this process. We also want to note that there may be kairotic moments that help pave the way for such curriculum revisions if we are paying close attention. In our case, our kairotic moment for deciding whether we should revise Digital Writing and Rhetoric was when the faculty of the program spontaneously began to see a need to reevaluate the shared values that made up the Professional Writing major’s recently revised outcomes and assessment plans.

In this article, we first offer a framework for responsive design, detailing flexible principles that are meant to be portable across varied institutional contexts. Secondly, as a case study of how this framework might be applied, we show how we used this framework to revise a foundational course (Digital Writing and Rhetoric) in our Professional Writing major. What makes this case compelling as an example of responsive design is the complexity of stakeholders, pressures, and pulls that influenced how we revised the curriculum of this course.

A Framework for Sustainable Responsive Design

Transitioning to a more responsive approach to programmatic design takes time, innovation, flexibility, and continued effort to sustain. As Meredith Johnson et al. (2017) note, sustainable program innovation requires simultaneous programmatic standardization and flexibility
during curriculum development (p. 31). They maintain that programmatic standardization, in the form of consistent learning outcomes and curricula that can be shared across faculty, and in particular graduate teaching assistants, lends sustainability to a program. For example, not only is Digital Writing taught by a mix of graduate students, contingent faculty, and tenure-line faculty, but because it is a required course in the PW major, as well as in the Emerging Technology in Business and Design (ETBD) major in a different college, that is scaffolded in the curriculum to provide a foundation for advanced courses in both majors, there is a need for a degree of consistency in the learning outcomes. As Johnson et al. argue, such consistency also enables easier assessment (p. 31). Yet, innovation, in the form of new communication technologies, emerging trends in the field, or shifts in major design, require a flexibility, a willingness to disrupt in order to reflect changing student needs (p. 32). Our approach worked at these intersections.

The strategies we detail below are generalized and may be revised or expanded to fit various institutional contexts. Even though we identify each of these pieces as discrete parts of a framework, these principles often overlap with each other in practice. This overlap is evident in the case study following our explanation of this framework, where we use specific examples from our redesign of the foundational Digital Writing and Rhetoric course in our Professional Writing program to illustrate how these principles were applied in our institutional context.

- **Identify historical and emerging patterns across systems of human and non-human pressures**: One of the key ways we recognized a growing need for change within our program was by taking care to reflect upon institutional pressures over time. These pressures came from a variety of human and non-human actors: students, faculty, emerging technologies, scholarly research, and more. For example, tracking the demographics of the students enrolled and their needs overtime may suggest the need for revision. By identifying and tracking these pressures at our institution, we were better equipped to develop and implement programmatic change that was simultaneously and responsively localized to our institutions and reflective of our broader field.

- **Identify institutional stakeholders’ needs**: First, catalogue the primary stakeholders of your programs (e.g., faculty, students, administrators, other departments, and so on) and research their needs. Researching stakeholder needs could start with documenting perceived needs based on your experiences, relationships, and understanding of stakeholders’ needs. These needs
might include your understanding of immediate needs, but we encourage faculty and administrators to consider both short and long-term needs of your stakeholders, including revisiting the ways in which the assignments map onto major outcomes and onto changes and emerging trends and values in the field. Additionally, we recommend validating the need for sustained assessment by including a more formalized review of regularly collected data by the department: This might include assessment data, comments from students in evaluation materials, survey data from an annual satisfaction survey, or correspondence with administration and other stakeholders.

- **Implement sustainable revision practices**: While ideally all of our courses would respond appropriately to a variety of pressures, revision to course content must also be supported by the strengths of the department. Subsequently, you may need to schedule smaller changes to curricular revision over time. For instance, revision may need to come in stages rather than a singular overhaul of a course. In our case, the faculty's decision to refine and revise the program outcomes made the argument for reshaping Digital Writing and Rhetoric more immediate and amenable.

- **Pilot new course options and curricular changes before implementation**: Alongside other sustainable revision practices like revising and supporting new programmatic outcomes and breaking down implementation into stages, we encourage administrators and faculty to pilot and test course revisions before working them into a more robust curricular revision. We took a year to pilot several sections of new course ideas with instructors whose research focus is digital rhetoric, user experience, and content strategy before refining our decisions and sharing them with the larger program.

- **Provide a variety of resources and sample materials for instructors**: Lastly, we recognize that major course revision requires resources in the form of workshops, meetings, readings, course syllabi, and more for instructors and other faculty members who were not directly involved in the revision of the course but will teach it. We recommend providing an overview of new changes to the course to instructors. This came in the form of a brief, two-page guide that detailed what specifically was changing in the program, why these changes would be helpful for our students, and so on. We focused on offering a variety of course materials—course syllabi, course schedules, course
readings, and so on—for instructors that were different but all met our revised program outcomes to show the areas in the course that were similar, while noting the broad flexibility built into the design.

In the rest of this article, we use examples from our case of revising a foundational course in our Professional Writing program (Digital Writing and Rhetoric) to help illustrate the complexity that this framework can help address when applied to curriculum redesign.

**Identifying Historical and Emerging Patterns Across Human and Non-human Pressures**

One of the key pressures we paid attention to when revising the foundational Digital Writing and Rhetoric course was its history in the curriculum of the Professional Writing major. We also had noticed a mismatch between the current curriculum of our Digital Writing and Rhetoric course and the evolving values and research trajectories from the broader field of TPC. We describe our response to both of these pressures—the historical context of the course and the mismatch in values—in detail in this section.

Our Professional Writing major was first developed in 2008 out of a former Technical and Scientific Communication major (McKee, 2016, p. 142). The Digital Writing and Rhetoric course is foundational to the Professional Writing major (all majors must take it), and it is also required of majors in the ETBD program at our institution. The course has similarities to the common curricular trends that Lisa Melonçon and Sally Henschel (2013) identify: content management, graphic design, among others (p. 53). It is meant to introduce students to frameworks for online composing practices and creating content that meets the needs of their audiences. However, the structure of the course had not been substantially revised since its creation in 2008. As technologies and practices for writing online evolved, we noticed that students were not always able to transfer these frameworks in areas like circulation and content strategy in ways that reflected emerging research and work in TPC.

Complicating the course’s programmatic context was its certification to fulfill relatively new general education Advanced Writing (AW) requirements at our institution. Although currently restricted to enrollment from Professional Writing, Emerging Technology in Business and Design, and Education majors, historically this course has served a wide variety of programs, majors, and requirements across campus. Because of wide appeal, around the time that the Advanced Writing requirement was established, enrollment in Digital Writing and Rhetoric
increased from 9 sections and 204 students in 2013–14 to 14 sections and 309 students by 2015–16 with enrollment growing to 20 sections and 418 students by 2017–18 (see Figure 1). The large growth in enrollment is part because when the Advanced Writing requirement was introduced in 2015, many departments and programs did not have internal courses that could satisfy the requirement, and some departments still do not have such coursework; thus, their students looked to courses from other majors that they could take to fulfill the Advanced Writing requirement. As of 2019, the English department courses account for approximately 24% of all of the possible Advanced Writing courses, making English the largest single source of course offerings for students to fulfill the Advanced Writing requirement (“Advanced Writing,” n.d.).

**Figure 1: Enrollment and number of sections per year of Digital Writing and Rhetoric**

Currently, the Professional Writing program offers approximately 16 sections of Digital Writing and Rhetoric per year to accommodate the needs of the Professional Writing and Emerging Technology in Business and Design majors for whom the course is required. Given the changing dynamics of this course as a key course in the writing requirement at our institution and the course’s importance to several programs across campus, it was vital to us to consider useful revisions proactively with these emergent trends in mind as we identified revisions for a wide and multi-faceted audience of students and faculty.

Another large pressure that prompted our revision of the course was the mismatch we sensed between the course’s curriculum and
evolving values and practices in the broader field of TPC. When we began our revision project, the Digital Writing and Rhetoric course focused on digital media by considering the unique affordances and constraints of alphabetic, sonic, and visual modes and genres of writing. The course was structured around a series of assignments where students chose a focal topic to examine by producing three separate alphabetic, sonic, and visual genres. For instance, a student with an interest in animal welfare would consider how best to relay their insights and calls to action through the three projects over the course of the semester. Students often encountered an emphasis on production as they engaged the aforementioned affordances through specific genres such as podcasts, visual imagery for social platforms, or YouTube videos. As such, the course seemed to privilege students learning to use particular sound, video, and image-editing software. Overall, we sensed a need to shift to a more holistic and ecological perspective of digital and networked media, helping students learn transferable frameworks for digital writing and rhetoric across genres and interfaces (Buley, 2013; Moatti, 2016; Nagel, 2016; Walls & Vie, 2017; Walls, Garcia, & VanShaik, 2017) as well as researching and evaluating digital content, design, and media through a range of methods including user experience, usability, and participatory design practices with their intended audience.

The previous course design made sense within older versions of the overall Professional Writing curriculum. However, in adopting a responsive approach that focused on the situated needs of the current students, we recognized the importance of scaffolding projects so that students could see the long arc process of developing online content that more closely mimicked the research, analysis, and composing practices of content strategy in the field and workplace.

We also wanted to make sure our revisions were informed by evolving values and research trajectories within the broader field of TPC. We had noticed that, although these values were evident and agreed upon among our faculty and the broader field, the Digital Writing and Rhetoric course’s curriculum was not reflective of current research regarding content and content strategy, circulation and networked writing, and user experience. We briefly explain how we incorporated these broader values and research trajectories into our course revision, largely through specific assignments meant to help students encounter these values.

**Content and Content Strategy**

Viewing writing as content brings with it a whole host of new possibilities and connotations. For instance, content can be conceptualized as
“conditional, computable, networked, and commodified” (Dush, 2015, p. 174). Viewing writing as content means that students “must imagine machine audiences, programmed to algorithmically manipulate any composed text—to mine, rank, process, match, reconfigure, and redistribute it—at many places in its rhetorical travels” (p. 176) (see also John Gallagher’s [2017] ideas about writing for algorithmic audiences and Angela Glotfelter [2019] for more on circulation and algorithms). Content’s commodification is something we teach our students, and many have already addressed how content’s commodification and subsequent governance by algorithms leads to undesirable shifts towards surveillance capitalism (Beck, 2015; 2016; 2017; 2018; Beck et al. 2016; Gillespie, 2010; 2012; 2014; 2015; 2017). These are just some of the ways that our connection of writing and content opened up this 200-level course’s curriculum to account for emerging scholarship, while supporting the kinds of learning opportunities students needed to better transition into the upper-level courses in the Professional Writing program and into their careers. Indeed, an increasing number of our graduates find content strategy a part of their job.

**Circulation and Networked Writing**

Another shift we wanted to accommodate in our redesign was the idea that content is produced within and circulated through distributed networks. Shaun Slattery (2007) calls this kind of working context a technocracy, wherein the technocracy creates an environment where information is fragmented, shared, and distributed across networks of different people with varying skills levels internally and externally. A key aim of our focus on circulation and writing networks was that students should graduate the program with experience identifying and analyzing the relationships across human and non-human actors in communication networks. Rachel Hinman (2012) is just one of the scholars who has encouraged researchers and practitioners to consider the kinds of experiences, content, and devices we encounter as fundamentally cross-platform, in-the-world, and convergent, where non-human actants (e.g., specific devices, location, wireless connections, etc.) inherently inform the ways that we communicate and develop content. In other words, “agency is not contained within a single unified human subject, but is the function of our relational position within a multifactorial matrix” (Sheridan et al., 2012, p. 103). A belief in writing as produced by the agencies of actors across distributed networks is part of an overall epistemological turn away from writing as a solitary act and a posthumanist shift towards recognizing our connection across and within matrices and networks of human and non-human actants (Sheridan et al., 2012; Eyman, 2015).
User Experience and Usability
The third facet we incorporated into the course redesign was user experience and usability, which Doug Eyman (2015) identifies as a “research tradition” that is “particularly appropriate for digital rhetoric” (p. 96) and tightly linked historically to TPC from the 1970s and earlier (Redish, 2010, p. 199). The research practices and methods bound to user experience and usability support students as they work to develop not just procedural steps on how best to use a product or interface, but also how people use and interpret interface information, along with how the interface connects to the users’ context (Mirel, 2013, p. 288). Just as important to this conversation of fundamental concepts is a question of timing: Guiseppe Getto et al. (2013) note that this kind of specialization in user experience is typically only found late in students’ undergraduate or even graduate education (p. 65). In this way, by engaging deeply with user experience and usability early in their college careers, students will have more experiences solving complex problems in low-stakes environments before exploring these concepts with community partners, clients, or in collaboration with their peers in upper-level courses. After encountering theories and research practices of usability and user experience in core courses, students are better equipped to encounter these ideas in more complex scenarios later in our program.

New Assignments
We took these emerging research areas into account while developing new assignments for the course. Overall, the revised course shifts from a modal-production-focused approach to a content-strategy-focused approach with an emphasis on circulation, platform awareness, digital networks and content development, and user research. We believe that focusing on digital content strategy—specifically the circulating media messages of a community over time—makes visible the intersections of writing, rhetoric, and technologies and enables us to develop approaches for working in digital spaces. Assignments include:

1. a rhetorical analysis,
2. a user research report, and
3. a content strategy plan.

We describe each of these projects in more detail below.

Project 1: Rhetorical Analysis. The first project, a rhetorical analysis, requires students to propose a community or brand to study for the duration of the class, describe why they chose that particular community/brand, and perform a content strategy analysis across their chosen group’s existing digital platforms, including websites, social
media, apps, etc. For this project, we recommend that students create a memo in which they propose their community/brand and analyze the community/brand’s existing content through rhetorical and circulation lenses. This memo will serve as both 1) a project plan proposal for projects 2–3 and 2) an analysis and audit of their chosen group’s current content strategy.

**Project 2: User Research Report.** The second project, a user research report, requires students to 1) develop sample content (content should be determined by what is appropriate by what platforms they have chosen, their target users, and so on) that represents their ideas from Project 1, 2) conduct user research to analyze user behaviors, emotions, and reactions regarding sample content, and 3) write a user research report that presents the findings of their research and identifies key takeaways for the design of their content. We recommend that the user research component of this project take the form of user interviews, but this component can be modified with other forms of user research depending on the context of the class, including usability tests, card sorts, focus groups, task analyses, and so on. As an alternative to students first creating sample content, students might 1) conduct user research more broadly to better understand user behaviors, expectations, motivations, and preferences related to their community/brand’s content and 2) discuss their interview findings and implications for their plan in a user research report.

**Project 3: Content Strategy Plan and Presentation.** The final project, a content strategy plan and presentation, requires students to develop a finalized content strategy plan and mockups in a report or proposal. Students should envision their audience as a key stakeholder associated with their community/brand who they’ll need to persuade to move forward with the proposed strategy. Using secondary research (e.g. published academic research, credible news articles, and organization websites), and research conducted in Projects 1–2, students will create a content strategy proposal that details their key content plan revisions and offers samples of these revisions in mockups. Lastly, students should present their content strategy plan visually using PowerPoint, Keynote, Canva, Google Slides, and so on; the formality/genre of this presentation may vary, including pitches, informal presentations, formal presentations, or interactive presentations.

**Identifying Institutional Stakeholders’ Needs**

Our approach to curriculum revision took into account the unique needs of both human and non-human stakeholders; however, we prioritized our primary stakeholders in this revision process: students,
teachers in the department, and faculty in related programs.

**Students.** As we mentioned earlier, one of the greatest indicators of a need for change was our review of student learning across the entire program. We asked: How are students transitioning from early stages in the program to advanced coursework? Which foundational aspects of the program are supporting students for the complex problem-solving they will later encounter? How prepared are students for the realities of client or community-based research and relationships? Asking questions like these and reflecting upon students' evaluations, suggestions, and stories encouraged us to make rigorous changes to the program, particularly to Digital Writing and Rhetoric.

**Teachers within the department.** Before the revision, we had conversations with teachers of Digital Writing and Rhetoric (both faculty and graduate students) who felt that the curriculum was outdated, was not meeting student needs, or simply felt that they did not like it for reasons they were not sure of themselves. Teachers were also trying to innovate the course in new ways but were restrained by the inflexible boundaries of the existing curriculum. These conversations were the first signals that something was amiss with the course. Such anecdotal evidence, especially if expressed by a majority of teachers, while not enough to warrant curriculum revision on its own, should prompt a closer look at what exactly might be causing dissatisfaction among teachers.

**Faculty in related programs.** Digital Writing and Rhetoric, a required course for all Professional Writing Majors, also fulfills requirements for the Emerging Technology in Business and Design (ETBD) major. The ETBD program shares a number of connections to the PW program, chief among them that some of the Professional Writing faculty also hold affiliate appointments in ETBD and that students in both programs take Digital Writing and Rhetoric. Shortly after we began revising Digital Writing and Rhetoric, the authors met with key stakeholders in the ETBD program to discuss a structural curriculum revision happening in ETBD and to better understand the ways that Digital Writing and Rhetoric could provide a stable foundation for the various paths that students would take vertically through both majors. Taking a posthuman perspective in curricular design was important to us as we proactively responded to a complex ecosystem of actors: namely, students, faculty, emerging technologies, research, and workplace practices. A posthuman perspective can mean a number of things, but chief among them are considering human and non-human influences in curriculum design and seeing actors (Latour, 2007) as always being
defined and working through their relationships with other actors.

**Emerging technologies.** As of 2019, around 72% of the U.S. population used social platforms with 75% of the population using some networked device, such as a laptop or desktop (Pew Research Center, 2019). Over 95% of the American population across socio-economic classes use cell phones, with a growing trend towards connecting all of these devices with different wearables in the Internet of Things economy (e.g., smartwatches, fitness trackers, etc.) (Wurmsen, 2019). Subsequently, students need to consider critically the affordances and constraints of diverse modalities of writing that enable accessing, assembling, and analyzing networked and digital content.

**Workplace practices.** As workplace practices continue to evolve to be more collaborative, distance-based, and networked, students need specialization in the kinds of complex, distributed work that happens across genres, media, platforms, and devices (Hart-Davidson, 2013; Pigg, 2014). Research shows that 50% of the American workforce will soon be remote and distributed; it is critical that students have experience managing and developing content in these distributed knowledge systems early in their careers (Radocchia, 2018). Students need support to not merely use the software, platforms, and devices they might encounter, but navigate the affordances of these technologies. In particular, students need to engage in reading practices and acquire composing practices across a variety of platform, channel, and venue affordances in order to create and circulate engaging content in a multi-platform and multi-device ecosystem.

**Career expectations and goals.** Like many institutions, our students expect to leave the university largely prepared to enter the workforce. Students with degrees in Professional Writing from Miami University often get jobs in fields like marketing communications, public relations, and business, in addition to fields like publishing, editing, and others (see Figure 2) (Alumni Placement and Career Resources, 2018).
Across diverse career options, students increasingly need to develop digital compositions that reflect appropriate digital affordances, audiences, messaging, and modalities and to consider the ethics of digital composing and circulation.

Implementing Sustainable Revision and Assessment Practices

As broader research and interest trends have developed in TPC at large, the faculty of the Professional Writing major began to feel that the outcomes for the program should be revised to better support students to navigate “system thinking, collaboration, experimentation, and abstraction,” among other key ideas, within the curriculum and beyond (Ferro, 2013, p. 8). This process began in a collaborative workshop where faculty identified shared values, beliefs, and concepts that were central to the work of Professional Writing. Drawing on these beliefs and concepts, the faculty next developed a statement to identify outcomes: “[a]s professional writers and as Professional Writing students and faculty, we recognize the rhetorically complex, multi-mediated nature of writing. We think and act rhetorically, which means we recognize the constructed nature of knowledge, and we acknowledge, consider, and respond to multiple audiences, cultural contexts, power relations, and the situatedness of all writers. When we engage in new
networks and communities, we have an array of rhetorical strategies to navigate, participate, and contribute ethically in social action. To prepare students to be professional writers, students in the Professional Writing major will gain experience and meet learning outcomes in the following areas:” This statement informed a set of concepts and related outcomes for the Professional Writing major, which were finalized in October 2018:

- **Composing Processes**: Students will design, develop, draft, revise, and edit writing purposefully and reflectively, recognizing that writing processes vary depending on context, genre, medium, technology, and adapt accordingly.
- **Rhetorical Theory**: Students will assess the contexts for written communication (e.g., audience, purpose, social, and cultural context), synthesize, and apply rhetorical theories for researching, analyzing, and composing texts that are effective and ethical for their context.
- **Civic & Public Engagement**: Students will collaborate with communities in designing and revising communications that meet their needs, participating in and shaping public discourse in ethical and inclusive ways.
- **Intercultural Communication**: Students will analyze culturally specific communicative and knowledge-making practices and compose with rhetorical awareness, recognizing the relationship among rhetorics, cultures, and power relations in local and global contexts.
- **Digital & Multimodal Design**: Students will apply principles of visual rhetoric and design to analyze, evaluate, and create multimodal texts (e.g., data visualizations, conceptual maps, charts and graphs, infographics, social media content, websites, videos, and brochures), applying coding, accessibility, and usability standards for digital and multimodal production.
- **Writing Networks**: Students will recognize and analyze the social relationships among human and non-human actors in communication networks, and produce writing and content strategy for network circulation.
- **Project Management & Collaboration**: Students will identify and apply collaborative and project management strategies for researching, evaluating, and addressing client’s communicative needs and user needs.
- **Usability/User Experience**: Students will analyze, evaluate, and apply approaches for researching users’ behaviors, expectations, and experiences to design usable, useful, and accessible communications.
• **Professionalization**: Students will investigate career opportunities for professional writers and develop the ability to articulate the unique knowledge and skills they can bring to organizations. (Professional Writing Curriculum, n.d.) The inclusion of values like *Usability/User Experience, Writing Networks,* and *Digital & Multimodal Design* gave us an opportunity to imagine how the shared production of these values and conversation surrounding them might also present a kairotic moment for also considering how these values are introduced in the foundational Digital Writing and Rhetoric course. A revised assessment plan, explained in more detail below, also gave us a moment to reconsider the curriculum of this foundational course.

Meaningful assessment is vital to any curricular change and necessary to plan for in a responsive approach to program and course design. We also include an outcomes-based assessment rubric that shows how outcomes-based assessment can reveal outcomes that may need more emphasis or may need to be revised across a curriculum. We introduce these outcomes well aware of the critiques of outcomes-based assessment, which has been argued to open the door to competency-based education, a “highly individualized educational approach in which students amass credentials through demonstrated competencies, usually in a self-paced manner, rather than through ‘seat time’ (i.e., courses and curricula)” (Gallagher, 2016, p. 22). Some might argue that outcomes-based assessment could easily be co-opted into a plan for education that figures learning as mere competencies. While we have no easy answers for what always to do in situations, what we can do is view vertical curriculum, coordinated outcomes, and meaningful assessment of those outcomes, as a way of trying to determine whether students are learning what we hope they are in our major and how we might adjust our curriculum iteratively.

When revising the major’s outcomes, the Professional Writing faculty also reevaluated the assessment plan; overall, the faculty completed these goals in three-tiered revision tasks:

• Tier 1: Revise the learning and major outcomes mapping them onto specific courses,
• Tier 2: Revise the assessment of the major to reflect the revised major outcomes, and
• Tier 3: Revise courses to better reflect the major outcomes.

The ecology of these tiered revisions worked together to open a space for discussing what shared values faculty believed to best reflect Professional Writing and to ensure a consistent focus on those values throughout the major. It was during Tier 3 of the revision process that
PW faculty identified the Digital Writing and Rhetoric course as being the most in need of significant revision.

In Tier 2 of the revision, PW faculty worked toward a more robust vertical assessment of outcomes in the major, tracking outcomes across time. As a way to assess the outcomes, faculty choose to focus on projects PW majors developed in three senior-level courses required in the major: the Professional Writing Capstone, the Rhetoric & Writing Capstone, and Visual Rhetoric, since these projects should address most outcomes and reflect experiences and skills gained while completing other courses in the major as well. Because visual rhetoric includes several different assignments, faculty will sample one assignment that provides the best potential for student work to demonstrate the outcomes measured in the current cycle. For example, in year 1 we might assess the community partner project; in year 2 we might assess a data visualization assignment.

Because assessing all nine outcomes in all sections of the three courses each year would prove overwhelming, a PW assessment committee (consisting of the PW Director and rotating faculty from the program who had not taught a capstone course that year) assess three of the nine outcomes on a rotating basis. For example, in year 1 the team plans to assess outcomes on intercultural communication, civic & public engagement, and professionalization; in year 2 the team will assess outcomes on writing networks, digital & multimodal design¹, and composing process; in year 3 they will assess outcomes on rhetorical theory, project management, and usability and user experience. The following year the team will again assess intercultural communication, civic & public engagement, and professionalization, and so on. The assessment team looks at artifacts from the three 400-level courses and uses a four-point numerical scale (1=fails to meet; 2=minimally meets; 3=meets; 4=meets to highest level) to quantitatively measure each outcome over time as means to identify outcomes that need refining within specific courses. In other words, we use the rubric not to evaluate specific courses immediately, but evaluate key outcomes to identify what courses need further review. The rubric categories are drawn from the outcome description. For example, the writing networks rubric criteria reads, “Recognizes and analyzes the social relationships among human and non-human actors in communication networks, and produces writing and content strategy for network circulation”: this approach better aligns our assessment questions with our revised

¹ The faculty chose to assess the digital & multimedia design in year two in order to provide time for students who would take the revised digital rhetoric course to progress to the 400-level courses.
outcomes (see Appendix A for full rubric). The results are compiled into a report and shared with not only the Provost’s Office but also with faculty at an annual retreat as a way to continue conversations about course revisions.

Each assessment cycle should yield insights that will direct curricular changes to be measured in the next rotation. For example, results from Year 1 assessment might direct us to better foreground professionalization in our courses; we would then assess those revisions in year 4.

In addition to a direct assessment, the PW faculty developed indirect assessment methods, including surveying PW seniors’ perceptions of learning regarding all nine outcomes every 2–3 years. The survey asks students to rate their learning in relation to the outcome and asks which classes they associated with particular learning experiences. This data helps us identify whether and where students recognize encountering and developing expertise in outcomes and informs where our courses need to better emphasize specific outcomes and related skills.

**Piloting New Options**

Before committing wholeheartedly to our new design, we, the authors, piloted the course and refined it. First and foremost, we piloted the changes in our own courses and refined the structure of the course. To do this, we had a regular standing meeting to compare strategies, discuss project ideas, and note challenges and successes over the course of the academic year. These meetings helped us identify patterns regarding issues like student comprehension of difficult concepts that we needed to spend more time on and different and flexible ways of teaching new assignments. Ultimately, these regular meetings also gave us a convenient site for discussing many of the tensions we detailed above in terms of the needs of various stakeholders, the implications of the history of the course, and much more.

**Providing Resources and Support for Instructors**

While many stakeholders were in favor of a course redesign, we also had to consider how we were going to transition to a new design and how to make that transition sustainable for all stakeholders: What resources or training would be required to support faculty as they taught the new version of Digital Writing and Rhetoric? Here, we briefly share our process for providing these resources.

We documented how the new assignments mapped onto the revised outcomes for the instructors who would be teaching the course, while offering an overview of the key revisions to outcomes
and assignments in a short brief that could be accessed digitally by instructors as needed. Additionally, we collected suggested readings for students, sample projects, and readings and resources for those instructors who may not have taught concepts like circulation or content strategy before. We aimed to be intentionally inclusive and diverse with the readings assigned.

We also hosted a workshop for all of the instructors teaching the new design to discuss the primary changes to the course and our successes and challenges piloting it. We not only provided suggested readings for students and extended readings for instructors, but also provided an opportunity to contextualize these resources and changes with those that piloted the course. After a larger group of instructors taught the newly designed course, we hosted another workshop to de-brief and address challenges and suggestions for revisions, all of which were documented in shared folders for all instructors.

A crucial component for the sustainability of the revised course was providing faculty and administrators in related programs (such as the ETBD faculty) access to the set of materials we created for PW instructors teaching the course, so they could evaluate how the revised course could continue to function in their own programs. Specifically, we provided related programs 1) the overview of the revisions and how they reflected the skills students needed to critically analyze online content, 2) sample syllabi that offered varied approaches that still reflected the revised outcomes, and 3) class readings from which to draw for the course. When ETBD faculty initially involved in the revision were no longer part of the ETBD curriculum revision committee, it was these resources that reminded the revision committee of the shared outcomes the revised course reflected across the ETBD and PW programs. As such, the materials served not only as support for instructors teaching the course, but as evidence and application for administrators outside of our immediate program of the course’s revised outcomes.

**Conclusion**

Ultimately, dynamically responsive and proactive curricular change is challenging work. It requires prioritizing 1) revision grounded in scholarship and emergent technologies and work trends, 2) feedback and support from multiple human and non-human stakeholders across an institution, and 3) an ecological approach for developing consistent outcomes and assessment to balance and course-correct curricular revision. We hope that this profile serves as a starting place, a model, and an acknowledgement of the hard work, challenges, and benefits
of dynamically responsive and proactive course revision and curricular change.
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### Appendix A: Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composing process: recognizes that writing processes vary depending on context, genre, medium, technology, and adapting accordingly</th>
<th>1: Fails to meet</th>
<th>2: Minimally meets</th>
<th>3: Meets</th>
<th>4: Meets to highest level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The artifact does not demonstrate appropriate composing decisions in relation to medium, genre, and technology for the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td>The artifact shows some attention to identifying an appropriate medium, genre, and technology but does not demonstrate appropriate composing decisions across medium, genre, and technology for the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td>The artifact demonstrates appropriate composing decisions in relation to medium, genre, and technology for the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td>The artifact demonstrates appropriate composing decisions in relation to medium, genre, and technology for the rhetorical situation as well as an advanced reflection of why these were appropriate choices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Theory: applies rhetorical theories for researching, analyzing, and composing texts that are effective and ethical for their context.</th>
<th>1: Fails to meet</th>
<th>2: Minimally meets</th>
<th>3: Meets</th>
<th>4: Meets to highest level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The artifact reflects little attention to rhetorical theories, strategies, or frameworks for the assignment context.</td>
<td>The artifact is inconsistent in reflecting the effective and ethical use of rhetorical theories, strategies, and frameworks for the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td>The artifact reflects the effective and ethical use of rhetorical theories, strategies, and frameworks for the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td>The artifact reflects the effective and ethical use of rhetorical theories, strategies, and frameworks for the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic &amp; Public Engagement: illustrates ability to collaborate with communities in designing and revising communications that meet their needs, participating in and shaping public discourse</th>
<th>1: Fails to meet</th>
<th>2: Minimally meets</th>
<th>3: Meets</th>
<th>4: Meets to highest level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The artifact does not reflect working with communities to co-design public communication in ethical and inclusive ways.</td>
<td>The artifact reflects some collaboration with communities but may lack significant participation in co-designing a public communication in ethical and inclusive ways.</td>
<td>The artifact reflects the ways in which students collaborated with communities and incorporated their needs in co-designing a public communication in ethical and inclusive ways.</td>
<td>The artifact reflects an advanced understanding of participatory design and illustrates the ways in which students collaborated with communities and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Miami University PW faculty collaboratively developed the outcome statement and identified nine outcome areas. In consultation with the PW faculty, the PW assessment committee, including Tim Lockridge, Johnathon Mauk, Heidi McKee, Michele Simmons, and Adam Strantz revised the PW major assessment plan and developed the assessment rubric.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in ethical and inclusive ways. (will include <strong>meta-analysis</strong> by the authors about the project)</th>
<th>incorporated their needs in co-designing a sustainable public communication in ethical and inclusive ways.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural communication:</strong> analyzes culturally-specific communicative and knowledge-making practices and composes with rhetorical awareness, recognizing the relationship among rhetorics, cultures, and power relations in local and global contexts.</td>
<td>The artifact may acknowledge cultural context but demonstrates a weak analysis of and composing with rhetorical awareness for power relations in culturally-specific communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The artifact fails to acknowledge the relationship among rhetorics, cultures, and power relations or is culturally insensitive to the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td>The artifact demonstrates an advanced and nuanced analysis of and composing with rhetorical analysis for power relations in culturally-specific communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital and multimodal design:</strong> applies principles of visual rhetoric and design to analyze, evaluate, and create multimodal texts (e.g., data visualizations, conceptual maps, charts and graphs, infographics, social media content, websites, videos, brochures), applying coding,</td>
<td>The artifact does not reflect effective principles of visual rhetoric in its analysis or display of the digital and multimodal production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The artifact inconsistently reflects principles of visual rhetoric or fails to address accessibility and usability standards for digital and multimodal production</td>
<td>The artifact reflects effective analysis and production (including accessibility and usability) of digital and multimodal production.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The artifact demonstrates an advanced and complex analysis and production of digital and multimodal production.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project management &amp; collaboration: identifies and applies collaborative and project management strategies for researching, evaluating, and</th>
<th>The artifact demonstrates few ways in which students collaboratively planned and (co)wrote community/client communication solutions.</th>
<th>The artifact demonstrates the ways in which students collaboratively planned and (co)wrote community/client communication solutions.</th>
<th>The artifact demonstrates nuanced and advanced ways in which students collaboratively planned and (co)wrote community/client communication solutions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing networks: recognizes and analyzes the social relationships among human and non-human actors in communication networks, and produces writing and content strategy for network circulation.</td>
<td>The artifact does not demonstrate an effective analysis of the ways in which content circulates and the human and non-human forces that affect content production and circulation. The artifact does not demonstrate effective rhetorical choices in producing content for circulation.</td>
<td>The artifact demonstrates an awareness of the ways in which content circulates and the human and non-human forces that affect content production and circulation but offers a weak analysis of the social relationships among humans and non-human forces in this circulation. The artifact demonstrates a limited awareness of the rhetorical choices for producing effective content for circulation.</td>
<td>The artifact demonstrates a nuanced and advanced analysis of the ways in which content circulates and the human and non-human forces that affect content production and circulation. The artifact demonstrates effective rhetorical choices in producing content for circulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usability/ User Experience:</strong> Identifies and applies approaches for researching users’ behaviors, expectations, and experiences to design usable, useful, and accessible communications.</td>
<td>The artifact demonstrates little or no awareness of effective methods and methodologies for conducting user research nor for illustrating how that research informs usable, useful, and accessible communications for the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td>The artifact demonstrates some effective use of methods and methodologies for conducting user research but may not demonstrate the ways in which those findings inform usable, useful, and accessible communications for the rhetorical situation.</td>
<td>The artifact demonstrates effective use of methods and methodologies for conducting usability research and demonstrates the ways in which those findings informed usable, useful, and accessible communications for the rhetorical situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalization:</strong> Investigates career opportunities for professional writers and articulates the unique knowledges and skills PW majors can bring to organizations.</td>
<td>The artifact reflects limited investigation of career opportunities for professional writers and demonstrates few knowledges and skills of PW professional identity; extensive gaps and errors exist.</td>
<td>The artifact reflects some investigation of career opportunities for professional writers and demonstrates some knowledges and skills of PW professional identity, but some gaps and errors exist.</td>
<td>The artifact reflects investigation of career opportunities for professional writers and demonstrates knowledges and skills of PW professional identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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George Washington University’s Professional Writing Program is an untraditional professional development program designed for teams in corporate, non-profit, and government organizations and housed in the school’s University Writing Program. Our clients are “workplace” writers, rather than what we traditionally
think of as “professional” writers, meaning that they are most often not individuals with “writer” or “editor” in their job title. Rather, their titles, positions, and industries vary widely. The workshops offered through the program sit somewhere in between consulting, class, and training. They combine expertise, writing pedagogy, and professional development best practices, while seeking to instill both genuine, long-term writing improvement skills and immediately applicable strategies for working professionals. This program looks different from other community partnerships in writing programs, such as service learning or internships, but provides the university and the partner organizations with similar benefits; most notably, GW forms more and deeper connections with our city. We bring back to the university “real-world,” authentic workplace writing experiences, which we are then able to share with our students both in the classroom and in our overarching curriculum development.

Institutional and Program Context

George Washington University is situated in downtown Washington, DC, where, relevant to this program, we are surrounded by an incredibly diverse, thriving community of governmental agencies; NGOs, lobbying, advocacy, and nonprofit organizations; corporations; other types of organizations.

The University Writing Program—the home of Professional Writing—became independent in 2003, separating from the university’s English Department. Encompassed in the UWP are the First-year Writing division, the Writing in the Disciplines program, the university’s Writing Center, and, most recently, the Professional Writing program. The UWP’s mission reads: “The University Writing Program (UWP) offers courses to strengthen every GW student’s ability to write clearly and effectively at the university and in other arenas, and emphasizes the importance of writing for success in all academic, public, and professional enterprises that require critical thinking and communication” (“About Us,” 2019). The Professional Writing Program is rooted in this mission, focusing on success in “professional enterprises that require critical thinking and communication.”

The UWP has had an ongoing—although informal—interest in public writing, due to both the varied backgrounds of our multi-disciplinary faculty and the nature of the First-year Writing program, which requires all GW students to take a four-credit, topic-based course designed by a member of the UWP’s faculty. Sample course titles include “Writing Science and Health: Women’s Health as Point of Inquiry,” “Embodyed Inequality: Rhetoric of Race and Racism,” “Fashion Emergency!: Clothing and Global Capitalism,” and “Please Like Us: Selling with Social
Media.”

**History of Program**

Although one might naturally assume the Professional Writing Program stems from an undergraduate or graduate program in the same area of study, the opposite is true. The public, client-based program is the first move the UWP has taken to formally focus on professional writing. In 2012, I was a part-time instructor in the University Writing Program (UWP) at George Washington University. I’d come from a somewhat untraditional background, having been a business writer, editor, and communications manager prior to earning an MFA in creative writing. Early on in my tenure at GW, the UWP’s then-executive director received a handful of inquiries, from both staff teams within the university and organizations around Washington, DC, about workplace writing consultation and workshops. He reached out to me and asked if, given my background, I might be interested in developing and co-facilitating a series of workshops in this arena. Our first “client” was a staff team of eight IT specialists in our university’s Academic Technology department. We designed a six-workshop series for them based on several conversations and informal assessments of written documents the team had provided. Soon after, another team within the university, our External Relations group, heard about the workshops, and asked us to run a similar series for a team of fifteen employees. During this time, we also began offering one-on-one tutoring to individual or paired staff members.

It was around this time that I was hired as a full-time Assistant Professor in the UWP, and as a part of my responsibilities, I was to develop a more formal program. In a document to GW’s Columbian College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s office in 2013, I wrote a series of objectives for both the program and for our clients:

**Objectives for University Writing and the University**

It is our hope that the development of this Professional and Technical Writing Training Program will:

- Create diverse revenue streams for UWP and the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences
- Establish UWP faculty as experts locally and nationally in the field of Professional and Technical Writing
- Provide a foundation for the UWP to become a crucial—and missing—channel between the business world and the academe when it comes to work-readiness and its tie to written communication
- Develop partnerships between GWU and local government, corporate, and non-profit organizations
Objectives for Clients
Client participants will learn to:
• Better identify and cater their writing appropriately for varying audiences, purposes, and relevant genres of writing
• Gather requirements for large-scale writing projects in an efficient and detailed manner
• Put into action a writing process that includes planning, gathering feedback, revising, editing, and proofreading
• Utilize the skills of other members of their teams for more successful collaborative writing and editing processes
• Provide more meaningful feedback on others’ writing projects
• Identify and correct common grammar and punctuation errors in their own work and the work of others
• Produce and edit work that is clearer and more persuasive

We needed minimal buy-in from the college to begin (although the administration has, in many ways, made expansion challenging—more on this below), and so we made ourselves searchable online. We began receiving one or two inquiries a week. At the time, we described our workshops this way:

“Customizable programs are available for large or small groups and on a one-time or long-term basis, allowing managers to increase the effectiveness of their employees’ writing by utilizing the skills, experience, and pedagogical knowledge of professional writing professors. Workshop topics range from large-scale issues like organization and the clarity of ideas to sentence-level concerns involving grammar and evaluation, one-on-one or small-group tutoring, or a combination of programs designed to meet an organization’s needs.”

To this day, due to our limited resources, we do not “market” our workshops. We have a web presence, and between that and word-of-mouth recommendations, we typically teach around three workshops each month.

Curriculum and Pricing
Since the program’s inception, the curriculum has evolved quite a bit, and we’ve learned that in a situation like ours—and in professional development more broadly conceived—curriculum and pricing are utterly intertwined.

We began offering only customized workshops. An organization
A Different Kind of Outreach

would approach us, and we’d work with them over time to assess their needs and their team members’ writing, collect input from various stakeholders and participants, and develop a workshop or series of workshops that addressed their specific goals. While I believe these workshops were successful in that we did good work in developing interventions that were genuinely useful to our clients, it wasn’t an ideal system. First, we simply weren’t charging enough to make it worth the time spent. However, if we raised our prices to truly reflect the time spent on customization, we found that we were “pricing ourselves out” in many ways. Most organizations allot a limited amount of funding for professional development, and substantial assessment and customization take a tremendous amount of effort. Further, as a very small program, we didn’t have the resources “on reserve” to have available when a client requests such customization.

Finally, after four years of small-scale workshops, we also found that the needs of our clients were not wildly varying. Most teams struggled with the same types of problems. And so, we worked to systematically categorize these struggles and develop a series of standardized workshop materials and plans. Understanding that a “one-size-fits-all” approach both had its benefits and its drawbacks, we didn’t make the shift lightly. Our current offerings include:

- **Building a Better Writing Process**
  1.5 Hours
  Instructor and Materials Fee: $600
  Registration Fee Per Participant: $275

- **Tone, Voice, Style, and Diplomacy in Workplace Writing**
  2.5 Hours
  Instructor Fee: $650
  Registration Fee Per Participant: $350

- **Narrative Workplace Writing**
  2.5 Hours
  Instructor Fee: $650
  Registration Fee Per Participant: $350

- **Writing Skills for Technical Professionals**
  2.5 Hours
  Instructor Fee: $650
  Registration Fee Per Participant: $350

- **Copyediting Workshop**
  3.5 Hours
  Instructor and Materials Fee: $750
  Registration Fee Per Participant: $400
• **Online and Social Writing for Professionals**
  
  6 Hours  
  Instructor and Materials Fee: $1,100  
  Registration Fee Per Participant: $750

A full catalog of our workshops with descriptions can be found at https://writingprogram.gwu.edu/professional-writing-training (George Washington University, 2019).

What is customizable—or rather, what changes from one workshop to the next—is the discussion of process within the organization. These include specific constraints and opportunities of the organization, and the individual and team work that participants complete during our time together. Such in-workshop activities are designed to speak directly to current projects of the team and to apply immediately. For instance, in a workshop on Tone, Voice, Style, and Diplomacy, participants might be asked to describe the tone in a passage of their work, and then perform a mini-rhetorical analysis of the document, pointing to specific language choices they made regarding audience and purpose.

In developing the multiple iterations of this program, we took lessons from both workplace training and professional development, broadly considered, and from degree-granting institutions and academic programs in professional writing, editing, and business and technical communication. More than anything I am teaching them about process, and I am serving as a sounding board and advice giver. Specifically, the workshops place an emphasis on process pedagogy, working to develop in participants an understanding of the writing process as central to any successful writer or team. In conceptualizing this focus, I relied on Blyer’s famous “Process-based Pedagogy in Professional Writing,” particularly the three key elements she identifies of the process:

1. Variety, meaning that every writer approaches things differently and there is no “correct” way to work
2. Recursiveness, or the understanding that stages repeat and may not always happen “in order”
3. Set activities, such as understanding a writing context, researching or collecting information, making decisions about tone and style, and revision, must occur for a text to ultimately be successful, even though what these points of process look like will vary between both people and projects (Blyler, 1987, p. 52).
This process-based approach allows me to speak to widely varying audiences working on substantially different types of writing projects with relative cohesion and usefulness. We talk about offering feedback. We talk about the places their problems pop up. We talk about invention.

Further, the sessions themselves are as “active” as my traditional undergraduate courses. Active learning, of course, increases engagement as well as learning (Park & Choi, 2014), and while it can be a tough sell to instruct a room full of financial advisors to “get into groups,” the outcomes are the same as when we do so thoughtfully in a traditional classroom; learners learn more by doing, talking, and truly engaging. This is especially true as we work to have our participants engage with their own recent or current workplace documents.

During this development process, we’ve tried several pricing models and, truthfully, I suspect we might continue to try new ways of working with cost. Currently clients pay a set “Instructor and Materials Fee” and a per participant registration fee. (See course list above with pricing.) Our 2.5-hour “Narrative Workplace Writing” workshop represents an average price, at $650 for the Instructor and Materials and $350 per participant. If an average team who brings us in registers seven people, the total cost to them is $3,100. Because the workshops are now standardized, this represents no more than three hours of work total for the instructor, including set up and breakdown.

Faculty
The program is mostly a one-woman show in that I developed it, I manage sales, budget, and other administrative tasks, and I facilitate most of the workshops. My own background lends itself well for this type of work in a few ways. First, I spent the first six years of my career working for a professional development company. While the emphasis there was on project management, contract management, and business analysis, I was able to learn a tremendous amount as I made my way through two administrative positions (one in the equivalent of a Student Affairs office and one in Instructor Relations) before landing a communications manager role in the marketing department. I believe that this experience, particularly on specific projects related to curriculum development and white paper writing, were crucial to giving me a running start, so to speak, in building this new, much smaller-scale professional development program. Additionally, prior to my academic career, I worked as a freelance writer and editor, which gave me some important glimpses into a variety of types of organizations. This allowed me, in developing this program at GW, to start with a genuine and diverse knowledge of the types of writing, work, and workplaces
around Washington, DC. Finally, my research relates to the program as well, as I explore topics related to the transfer of writing knowledge and skills from the university into the workplace.

**Clients**

We have been somewhat surprised by the variety in types of clients who’ve sought out our workshops, and from this we’ve come to understand that writers in all types of organizations struggle with their writing. We’ve trained lawyers, financial analysts, IT specialists, administrative assistants, marketers, and publishing professionals, to just name a few. On the whole, technical professionals have been the group we’ve worked with most often, but not by a large margin. Occasionally we work with teams where every member performs similar work (a group of four financial analysts in one organization, for instance, or a team of public relations professionals in another). More often, though, the teams we meet are diverse in terms of job function. For instance, a federal government team that we worked with for six sessions included two lawyers, an administrative professional, two international development professionals, and a trade specialist. Another group included all eight employees in a small lobbying firm, each with a very different set of responsibilities and background.

**The Ongoing Challenge of Expansion Attempts**

The long-term goal of our small program has always been to expand to reach and teach new types of students, and as early as 2012 we discussed a diverse set of potential avenues, including public workshops that professional individuals could sign up for, professional certificates, graduate certificates, and an undergraduate minor. Despite a series of proposals, meetings with administrators in the dean’s office of our college, some larger buy-in, and a lot of work, none of these attempts have been successful. The larger college and university administration have been a roadblock to such expansion, for both financial reasons and staff turnover.

The only way expansion and diversification has genuinely taken place is within the framework of university department “client”: the Applied Economics Master’s program at GW. The program administrator reached out to us to develop and facilitate a six-series workshop on professional writing in the field of economics. In the future, we would consider other similar partnerships as a way to diversify and expand.

**Developments and the Future of the Program**

For now, then, we continue to work to improve, grow our current offerings, and expand our client base. The most recent development has been a move toward assessment in the program. This takes the form,
on the most basic level, of a fairly simple post-workshop evaluation survey that students can opt to complete (about 80 percent do). The survey includes rating questions, such as asking students to mark on a scale of one to five how knowledgeable they found the instructor to be, whether or not they gained implementable strategies, and whether or not they were likely to recommend the workshop to others. It then asks open-ended questions, such as what they found most useful and least relevant to their work. This assessment has been useful in that it has made clear one unit that participants found moved too quickly, allowing me to revamp the section. It also points to, in some sense, how well supervisors or professional development officers “chose” the workshops that the specific teams needed. For instance, with one organization we might see that almost every unit covered was useful and relevant; in another company, with the same workshop facilitated by the same instructor, these same skills might be deemed irrelevant to participants’ work. This is something we now work to combat in pre-workshop conversations.

However, I felt that the evaluation wasn’t an entirely useful assessment, as it, like most professional development training, could really only measure participant reactions (Erickson, Noonan, Brussow, & Carter, 2017, p. 686). So, while we continue to implement it, we also began to look for a more holistic tool for assessment, and we pretty quickly found the Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development Training (HQPD Checklist), a tool designed by Amy S. Gaumer Erickson, Patricia M. Noonan, Jennifer Brussow, and Kayla Supon Carter in the Center for Research on Learning at the University of Kansas. Their tool, published in 2017 in *Professional Development in Education*, takes into account the literature that speaks to what makes professional development high quality. It also takes into consideration that professional development is not the same as traditional college courses. Categories of the HQPD Checklist include Preparation, Introduction, Demonstration, Engagement, Evaluation, and Mastery.

In a preliminary self-assessment using the HQPD Checklist, we found that the GW Professional Writing Program met 20 of the 22 required characteristics of high-quality training, which included straightforward qualities, such as the training “provides an agenda” and “includes opportunities for participants to reflect on learning,” but also more complex requirements, such as “Details follow-up activities that require participants to apply their learning in a new setting or context” (Erickson et al., 2017, p. 687). For the latter, the program applied one of the workshops’ standby activities, which is grounded in the concept of “forward-thinking transfer” (“Forward-thinking Transfer,”
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n.d.), or the ways learners can better promote the transfer of knowledge and skills by conceptualizing and anticipating specifically how and when newly acquired knowledge might be applied in the future. Participants are asked in each workshop to write about future projects that a new writing skill, understanding, or process might apply to, and develop either a checklist or a step-by-step process for including their new learning. In the future, the HQPD Checklist tool will be used with the input of clients to ensure a more objective assessment and ensure future courses continue to meet these standards.

We plan to continue to add workshop options to our offerings, at the rate of two per year. We will rely on the expertise of current and incoming faculty to build these workshops. As we consider new topics and new forms, I believe that longer workshops (or multi-meeting workshops) will ultimately be beneficial to writers, even if the cost is higher. Our latest offering, “Online and Social Writing for Professionals,” for instance, is a six-hour workshop, with substantial built-in time for teams to strategize.

Finally, in the coming year we look forward to working more on outreach and marketing, as we look to expand our client base and work with more and varied organizations around the Washington, DC area.

Lessons Learned
I include this section not only for those program administrators who might hope to build a program that shares certain characteristics with our Professional Writing Program, but also as a collection of insights for all professional and technical communication instructors who seek to continuously develop their understanding of workplace writing experiences.

Start small. As mentioned above, we’ve done very little marketing beyond a web presence, and due to word of mouth, we’ve grown each year, albeit relatively slowly and in a way we’ve been able to manage. I believe the skills and interventions we are offering are needed throughout industry and government, and if offerings are beneficial and practical, other organizations will find us. Unless you have a huge pool of resources available from a program’s inception, this incremental growth is obviously highly preferable. Use the opportunity to gather information and requirements. Have long talks with clients about their concerns and needs. This work was incredibly time consuming in our program’s early years, but because of these conversations, I acquired a tremendous amount of “insider” knowledge about the way writing happens in organizations that was key to the later
development of our standardized workshops.

**There are benefits and drawbacks of autonomy in program building.** Although the Professional Writing program at GW is the only externally reaching program and the only revenue-generating division in the University Writing Program, most often it is not at the forefront of program discussions. This has, in some ways, offered me a tremendous amount of freedom to try new things. In other ways, more of a focus and more help—and this is something I could have advocated for, but didn’t—might have allowed for more rapid development or different ideas of how the program might move forward more swiftly or efficiently.

**Think about assessment prior to beginning.** Assessment is something I didn’t think hard enough about early on, and I believe we could have improved both the quality and quantity of our workshop faster had we started with assessment in the planning stage. I imagine that the Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development Training could be a useful tool for programs just starting out.

**Your resources will dictate everything about your program.** A clear understanding of the resources and support your institution will offer you, even if they’re minimal, is key to planning. Without it, you’re likely to sink—like I did—a lot of time and effort into ideas that stand little chance of coming to fruition.

**Workplace cultures can make this type of consulting extremely challenging.** One of the biggest challenges of doing this kind of work is rarely knowing the dynamic of a team prior to my arrival on the day of a workshop. *Are the participants motivated and excited to be there, or have they been forced to attend? Does the team work well together or is there tension? Do some types of team members feel more valued in the organization than others? What is the team’s relationship like with their supervisor(s)? Is the “boss” attending?* The answers to these questions can make a huge difference in how a workshop goes, and so it’s important to be as communicative as possible with the person seeking training about what makes a good workshop (and try to gather as much information about the team as possible through those conversations).

**Buy in is crucial.** Similar to the workplace cultures challenge above, gaining buy-in from participants is sometimes challenging, but these workshops will not be successful without it. Therefore, it’s crucial to emphasize from the start of working with supervisors or Human Resources/Training purchasers that they need to do some pre-workshop build up with participants, telling them why they’re bringing us
in (framed positively; never as punishment for “bad writing”) and what participants will gain from it. Similarly, I begin each session with a brief conversation about the specific ways their writing and work lives will improve through their hard work during and after our session.

**Understanding the world of corporate professional development is key.** Conference rooms full of employees are very, very different from the typical college classroom, of course, particularly with the added element of client expectations. In many ways, professional development or training companies make a better model than academia. If you don’t have an understanding of the basics of professional training across industries, building a program that works and meets expectations of clients (who send employees and bring in trainers all the time) will be extremely challenging. If you don’t have a background of professional development, this is one place where a consultant might be very worth your program’s investment.

**It’s more important to please “clients” than it is to please students.** To the point above, we make some compromises when it comes to how and what we teach. I know that teaching decontextualized grammar seldom yields long-term learning (Jones, Myhill, & Bailey, 2013), and yet, after many years trying, I’ve come to accept that the manager who constantly has to correct her employees’ sentence-level grammar and punctuation simply will not stand for anything less than comma drills; and so, in one workshop, we spend time on commas, culminating in a “Comma Competition.” Some things we do in our workshops come from student writing pedagogy and some things look more like professional development.

**There is an urgency to client work that simply can’t exist in the same way as in a traditional classroom.** This makes the work of teaching in organizations fascinating and urgent. When we talk about our undergraduate students, we often lament the lack of motivation or urgency they feel in the classroom. These are real challenges that we work hard to combat. In organizations, the repercussions to bad—or even simply average—writing is real and often severe. Recently, I was teaching at a large non-profit focused on human rights. One of the participants was, the week I was there, writing a testimony he would deliver to Congress the following week about his experience working with Syrian refugees over the past year. His need to write clearly, concisely, and persuasively was immediate; that makes teaching not only easier in many ways, but also exciting and fulfilling.

Continuously learning about the writing in workplaces is invaluable. Keeping a foot in the outside world allows me to bring back “real-
world” knowledge and workplace situations, projects, and experiences to my undergraduate students. We know that when we can engage students in something as close to “authentic” situations as possible we are helping them to better acquire transferable skills:

“Students who write within authentic contexts…are immersed in meaningful composing. They are also engaged in higher-order thinking, decision making, and genre learning. They are creating complex products using the same processes that professionals do. They are not simply reiterating forms and template; they are creating their own idea of what the genre is, based on their understanding of the audience, situation, and purpose of the task” (Bush & Zuidema, 2011).

This kind of work allows instructors to bring these situations back to the traditional classroom in a way that is unique and extremely valuable. In that way, such an outreach program—even one as untraditional as this one—brings lasting and important lessons back to more traditional technical or professional writing programs.
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In 1992, Ghana had a multi-party democratic election after about eleven years of military rule. The main opposition party complained that it was cheated in this election. Such complaints persisted throughout subsequent elections — complaints including double voting, fraud, and bloating of voters’ register. To address these, Ghana’s Electoral Commission (EC) adopted biometric verification technology. Biometric is a technology that authenticates a person by scanning and verifying the person’s physiological, chemical or behavior patterns. In elections, biometric verifies through fingerprint and facial recognition. For the EC, biometric verification of voters would help in “detecting and preventing practices of impersonation and multiple voting; expose electoral offences; provide transparency in results, and make it very hard for someone to use the particulars of a different person to vote” (Dorpenyo, 2020, p.2). Ghana’s use of biometric technology in elections is the focus of *User Localization Strategies in the Face of Technological Breakdown: Biometric in Ghana’s Elections*.

Each chapter examines an aspect of biometric use. In chapter 1, Dorpenyo introduces the election problems through his own experi-
ence and those of his research participants. In chapter 2, he discusses biometric technology and its perceived merits. Chapter 3 explains the decolonial method of the book, and chapter 4 provides detailed user experiences of the BVM which were manufactured in a Global North context for use in a Global South context. Chapter 5 examines linguistic localization while chapters 6 and 7 discuss user-heuristic experience localization, and subversive localization, respectively. Chapter 8 examines the social justice issues that arise from biometric use, and chapter 9 concludes the book with a call to participatory user localization.

Dorpenyo discusses three main user localization methods: linguistic localization, user-heuristic experience localization, and subversive localization. Linguistic localization embodies “local logics, rhetorics, histories, philosophies, and politics” (Agboka, 2014, p. 298) thus creating a “nexus between local-global culture and context of use” (Dorpenyo, 2020, p. 103). By linguistic localization, Dorpenyo means language use “by local users to maintain the logic of technology which has been adopted” (p. 103). He points out that “this use of language to describe exceptional features of the biometric did not emanate from the designers of the technology but from the users of the technology, through locally designed genres” (p. 103). In such discourses, Kitalong (2000) posited, “technology emerged as the hero, endowed with magical powers and therefore undaunted by age-old political, economic, and social barriers” (p. 308).

Next, Dorpenyo extends Johnson-Eilola and Selber’s (2013) idea of heuristic problem-solving to discuss how the biometric election technology users he encountered have used what some people may call “unscientific” means of solving technological breakdown. When biometric election technologies broke down due to environmental problems, some users had to clean their hands with Coca Cola and dry them with a hot coal pot. Election observers called these methods unscientific. This designation exemplifies Johnson’s (1998) observation that users are considered to dwell in “the land of the mundane” (p. 3). Dorpenyo argues, however, that users’ heuristic methods in this context are responses influenced by users’ expertise and experiences of curbing “unpredictable real-life situations” (p. 136).

Additionally, the author discusses subversive localization. Following Spinuzzi’s (2003) idea of idiosyncratic adaptations, Dorpenyo (2020) reiterates that users “reconfigure the original intent of a technology” (p.146). Subversive localization thus refers to “the determination of users to redesign technologies or documents to fit local exigencies” (p.146). He exemplifies this kind of localization with how the officers of the EC created an operational manual for a biometric technology they
did not design. One of the officials reported the inadequacy of the information contained in the user manual that accompanied the biometric technology. As such Dorpenyo suggests that “we need to study localization from bottom-up” (p.145) or from the so-called “mundane” spaces of users (Johnson, 1998, p. 3).

In the rest of the book, the author proposes ways of decolonizing biometric use. One major way is a focus on social justice — an issue that program directors and instructors need to centralize in their syllabi. Researchers, program directors, and instructors must ask constantly, “How do we help users to communicate their agency to designers?” (p. 192). This question is crucial to creating practical changes in the relationship between designers and users. Our students — as future practitioners — are key agents and advocates in forging this relationship. Although we are advocating for users, our advocacy has the tendency of being locked up behind computer passwords and on library shelves. Communicating circumstances in which technologies fail and marginalize could help designers rethink their design decisions. This book signals how technical communication practitioners, program directors, and instructors could become “more active social justice advocates” (p. 193).

Throughout the book, Dorpenyo reiterates the problematic of localization—the process of making a digital product (e.g., biometric technology) fit into specific user contexts—specifically the cleft between localization at the designers’ sites and the users’ sites. This cleft created a clash of cultures and produced a disconnection between design culture and use culture. Localization has long been thought about in terms of adding or tweaking some features on technical objects in the name of accommodating the cultures into which these technical objects are being transferred. But localization is more than that. Agboka (2014) and Sun (2012) pointed out that the users’ needs must be the focus of localization projects. Dorpenyo continues this conversation and gives us a cogent exemplification of the dangers that result from neglecting users’ needs.

User Localization is timely because it analyzes Global Southern users’ strategies for negotiating the problem of failed localization. This is a challenge that program directors, and instructors must address — the inclusion of the South in pedagogy to guide students’ global context awareness. Johnson’s (1998) user-centered approach has received considerable critical attention in technical communication scholarship with much focus on technology design (Brady, 2004; Salvo, 2001); advocacy for UX pedagogy (Sun, 2012); and human-centered approaches to design (Jones, 2016; Rose, 2016). While these works
advocate that designers become more conscious about users, there
is a missing account about how users themselves are also practicing
localization for their own purposes when they discover that certain
localized technologies did not meet their exigencies. More so, these
accounts are largely absent in the contexts of Global South users of
northern technologies.

As globalization intensifies, program directors and instructors have
the imperative to engage scholarship from both hemispheres. Chap-
ters 8 and 9 could guide class discussions about marginalization in
technology design in the Global South where localization is an alarm-
ing problem. Program directors, and instructors could also be guided
by the book’s bottom-up decolonial approach in their program, and
class designs by starting brainstorming from failure narratives and
build up to solutions and design strategies. Graduate students try-
ing to understand unfamiliar contexts and searching for interesting
research ideas have, in this book, an excellent entry into a rewarding
inquiry.

Dorpenyo attempts to cite as many as possible researchers who
have engaged with the ideas in conversation here. However, some
key scholars are missing. I am talking here about people like Ngugi
wa Thiong’o (1984) whose idea of “decolonizing the mind” could shift
the discussion about decolonizing technology towards a postcolonial
agency. Or Franz Fanon (1961), who has proposed a radical under-
standing of the post-colonial state’s leadership. His diagnosis of the
“colonial intellectual,” who works against the powerless postcolonial
subject, could help us understand the logic of technology adoption.
Nonetheless, User Localization is a fruitful discussion that has come to
enrich the field of technical communication.
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The Bureau of Labor Statistics does not classify “project manager” as a position (DiVincenzo, 2006, p. 19), but the field of project management has grown massively since the 1990s. To meet the growing demand, graduate-level certificate and degree programs have risen in the last two decades. Professional organizations, including the Project Management Institute (PMI), have grown in recognition, and the almost one million holders of PMI’s Project Management Professional certification command salaries 23% higher than those without that certification (Earning Power, 2020). Terms related to project management, such as Agile and Scrum, are frequently used across many professions. Thus, the longstanding relationship between project management and Technical and Professional Communication shouldn’t be surprising. Moreover, the ability to perform project management has been growing as an expected competency for new technical writing graduates. Eva Brumberger and Claire Lauer, for instance, reported in 2015 that 49% of technical writing and editing positions listed it as a desired quality. However,
at the same time, Brumberger and Lauer indicate, despite these increasing expectations, only 12% of TPC programs required courses and only 6% offered one as an elective.

Benjamin Lauren’s Communicating Project Management: A Participatory Rhetoric for Development Teams works to address this concern by helping TPC professionals and instructors shift the ways we conceptualize, analyze, and discuss the work of project management. The book is both timely and important because, as Lauren notes, despite the abundance of interest in it, “books on project management are relatively sparse. We’ve produced work that informs project management and how people practice it, but rarely have we made our unit of analysis project management” (p. 1). As a result, we have often positioned project managers solely as agents of increased efficiency rather than foregrounding and understanding their work as writers. Consequently, we have failed to “understand their communication work as inherently rhetorical” rather than as a set of skills (p. 1). Lauren’s book works to correct this emphasis on methodologies and efficiency by focusing on the rhetorical work of project managers as writers.

By drawing from feminist theory, activity theory, and conceptions of participatory design, among other areas, Lauren advances a framework of effective communication within project management he calls “participatory communication”. Lauren defines this term as having three overlapping characteristics, which are “generally reactive, but intentional [; focused] on future action[; and] is systems-based” (p. 55). Reactivity here means communication that responds to emerging problems, requiring that all members participate to negotiate issues as they emerge. The intentional aspect, however, helps Lauren to theorize the ways in which project managers act as writers, rhetorically shaping that reaction to focus their team’s efforts. This focus on future action extends this by showing project managers as writers who work to “anticipate roadblocks and build trust and goodwill” with their teams while also enabling an “entrepreneurial mindset” within teams by keeping them focused on each project building onto and into other future projects (pp. 56-57). Finally, conceptualizing participatory communication as systems-based shows the rhetorical dynamism of project management as it envisions the writing done as nested with a “flexible, adaptive organizational network that is built upon relation-
ships and feedback loops” that enable iteration, revision, and ongoing audience adaptation (p. 58).

Once this theoretical framework is developed, Lauren’s book illustrates it through three distinct case studies. The first case study analyzes and examines the results of 14 semi-structured interviews with individuals who self-identified as project managers or leaders. Through analysis of these interviews, Lauren presents a compelling illustration of how project managers work to create participatory possibilities within a team’s communication. He uses seven different factors (such as personality types, organizational culture, the effort given to support psychological safety, and development methodologies) to illustrate the complex rhetorical dynamics that project managers need to navigate. The second case study focuses on a different rhetorical dimension of the project manager as writer by looking at how project managers function as leaders. Lauren contrasts two distinct leadership styles and philosophies and illustrates the rhetorical performances involved with each. The final case study applies a version of Engeström’s (2001) Third Generation Activity theory to a reorganization at a technical firm involving six participants. Of the three case studies, this chapter’s dynamic representation of how participatory communication works as the six members negotiate changes in job titles, software usage, and organizational workflow is the most compelling and illustrative chapter.

Throughout the literature review, the development of his theoretical framework, and the presentation of the case studies, Lauren provides compelling illustrations of his concepts. Tables are used effectively to summarize key distinctions, and many of the more complex theoretical concepts are eloquently supported by well-designed figures that render the concepts in an accessible, expressive way. Readers are carefully guided through both the content of each chapter and the overall relationship of each section of the book with helpful metalinguage and summaries at the end of the chapter. Since Lauren is mindful that his book is not a “how-to-guide” for project management in technical communication, he designs structures to guide readers to sections most immediately relevant to their information needs.

Thus, for instructors, program administrators, and researchers who are interested in increasing the role of project management courses
offered as part of a TPC program, Lauren’s project is not sufficient. However, when coupled with materials that would provide more information and guidance for applying and using dominant project management paradigms, Lauren extends these discussions with an understanding of the rhetorical possibilities of project management. In short, the strength of Lauren’s book is in its detailed case studies and rich theoretical framework, which together help render a more complex, nuanced understanding of the communication space created when TPC and project management meet. Lauren’s project may also be useful for project management programs that are looking to help their students better understand how their work is understood by others. The case study on leadership strategies may be especially applicable to interdisciplinary leadership courses. Lauren’s case studies may also be useful to TPC programs providing a research methodology course, as his clear descriptions of his method and application of theoretical frameworks could provide fruitful discussion material.

For TPC practitioners and existing project managers, Lauren’s book may help to explicate assumptions about how communication works in their professional lives, enabling them to develop richer, more powerful rhetorical strategies in their work. As a result, they may achieve higher degrees of professional success, guide more successful projects, and build more effective communication with their project members. As many organizations strive to develop better inclusivity practices, Lauren’s reflection on the role of technology in creating inclusive and effective participatory communication may be timely and useful.

Lauren’s project is not an inclusive look at all areas of project management as it relates to TPC. Case study research, as Lauren notes, cannot be representative of all potential moments of how TPC and project management intersect. However, his three case studies demonstrate the importance of resisting the same mental trap of overemphasizing efficiency methodology and paradigms as collections of “skills” rather than complex rhetorical actions. As TPC programs continue to evaluate their curriculums and the outcomes needed for successful TPC careers, *Communicating Project Management: A Participatory Rhetoric for Development Teams* can help provide a balanced perspective while considering incorporating industry paradigms and certifications.
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In their introduction, Haas and Eble outline the significant objective of their volume: to apply the social justice turn more broadly to technical communication (TC). They highlight changes already made to the teaching of TC while indicating that “groundbreaking” texts are already more than a decade old. Haas, Eble, and the accomplished group of authors within the volume call for a wholesale modernizing of TC, a field they claim has been resistant to change. Drawing on social justice methodologies and cultural studies scholarship, Key Theoretical Frameworks offers new curricular and pedagogical approaches to teaching technical communication. Including original essays by emerging and established scholars, the volume educates students, teachers, and practitioners on identifying and assessing issues of social justice and globalization. For the most part, the text delivers on these goals and does so in an approachable way that may encourage instructors and program directors to adopt some, if not all, of the pedagogies included. The structure of the book leads to easy skimming and jumping in and out of contexts as one desires. The constant referencing of one chapter to another links the works together in a common thread that centers the reader on the collec-
tion’s intent of changing technical communication instruction.

The book utilizes a top-down approach to applying social justice and critical race theoretical frameworks to TC. It argues that in order to see change in TC, major adjustments are necessary in TC pedagogy. Program directors can imagine a program-wide implementation, considering the diversity of topics and applications. Instructors can benefit from the class-level case studies and student response data. Students, however, may find this book slightly out of their purview; the volume acts as more of a pedagogical directive than a guide for student learners. The focus is on a restructuring of teaching TC that includes a purposeful attention to embodiment. In order to enable a more inclusive definition of TC, communicators must understand the trials of others and resist longstanding hegemonic structures. The editors and authors effectively deliver this message and provide varied examples for moving forward.

Spanning twelve chapters, this volume addresses many areas of social justice pedagogy. It is divided by topics into four parts: embodiment, place, community, and diversity of discourse. The chapters in each section clearly fit and at the same time could situate well in other areas, as there is much intersectionality of thought throughout. Chapters seamlessly move from one to another and the reader gets a sense of progression toward larger-scale concepts and methods as the chapters advance.

The first chapter, “Apparent Feminism and Risk Communication” by Erin A. Frost, acts as a catalyst for later chapters by placing embodiment at the outset. Frost identifies apparent feminism as a “response to recognized risks” (27). Frost discusses the interrelatedness of risk situations and unjust ways bodies are exposed to risk. This joining of risk and embodiment speaks to instructors as they imagine shaping important communication assignments from this view. For program directors, Frost indicates that “culturally informed risk communication pedagogies are a particularly productive lens through which to think about TC pedagogies writ large” (26). At issue, according to Frost, is that many students in TC programs get little exposure to feminist criticism in their courses. Frost’s course focused on students’ own online embodiment. She asked them to take risks and made her research agenda apparent, and her students knew she studied them over the semester. Students resisted the concept of culture as part of risk. Frost explicates the effect of incorporating her research into her course for both theoretical and practical purposes. The clear presentation of class-level interventions offers course designers examples of implementing the feminist criti-
cism and lens Frost argues for.

Chapter Two, “Validating the Consequences of a Social Justice Pedagogy” by Cruz Medina and Kenneth Walker, explores the use of grade contracts in TC classes and the response of students. The chapter provides direct student reaction in their own words and unpacks some of the histories and entrenched practices that guide students’ beliefs regarding grades. Medina and Walker provide ample evidence to support their view of grade contracts, though it is unlikely the chapter will sway anyone with strong feelings against their use. Instead, instructors curious about contracts will find plenty to help them investigate and decide, and the chapter appears to meet this purpose.

Other chapters cover social justice tenets including environment, advocacy, and race. Several chapters cover race from different angles; a standout is Kristin R. Moore’s “Black Feminist Epistemology as a Framework for Community-Based Teaching.” Moore argues that the need to incorporate black feminism in technical communication “grows from… the longstanding suppression of black women’s thought and roles…” (188). This chapter utilizes a step-by-step clarification and approach to black feminist epistemology, making it more accessible to those who want to implement it into their curriculum. Moore provides excellent background and history on her topic and draws heavily on the work of Hill Collins to great effect throughout the chapter. Moore draws the line between feminism and black feminism and then outlines how to create a more inclusive approach to TC.

Another standout chapter is Matthew Cox’s “Shifting Grounds as the New Status Quo,” which argues for a riskier approach to implementing social justice into TC. Although individual instructors may find inspiration from Cox’s suggestions, program directors might be more hesitant to implement Cox’s admittedly more disruptive methods. Cox justifies his approach well from the outset, stating that changing workplace dynamics and cultural differentiation within these contexts make it unfair to avoid such discussions with students “who we will ask to navigate these increasingly complex workplaces” (287). Cox notes that placing students in risky, uncomfortable situations made them uneasy, but he explains “queer rhetoric does not seek to ‘play nicely’ within the constraints of what is professional or successful or efficient” (302). A TC course that emphasizes personal identity may seem off-topic. However, Cox shows, through a study of three students, how the material and discussions regarding their personal journeys led them to their professional identities. Consequently, the chapter does “play nicely” in helping instructors see the value of applying queer rhetoric to TC.
The volume contains no unimportant chapters, and the integrated references to other chapters create a thread throughout its content. Formatting is different among the chapters in that some authors use tables and charts, while others rely exclusively on prose so that each chapter feels fresh. Jessica Edwards’ “Race and the Workplace” uses only prose to indicate how to apply critical race theory to TC by engaging students in language use discussions. Her narrative-style case study effectively demonstrates how students react to the effect of small language choices. Conversely, Natasha Jones and Rebecca Walton opt for a more visual delivery in “Using Narratives to Foster Critical Thinking About Diversity and Social Justice” by using charts and graphics. The list of figures and tables for the volume is small, which speaks more to the quality of writing and use of narrative to achieve their desired outcomes.

In sum, Key Theoretical Frameworks offers a diverse group of methods for implementing social justice pedagogy into TC. Although the core audience for this title may have significant familiarity with its topic, the text presents its material in a way that those new to or curious about social justice in TC instruction can benefit. Instructors can find several class-level studies to model classroom activities after. Program directors can utilize the book’s top-down approach in many chapters, which view social justice and TC with a wider lens. The chapters are organized well and the inter-referencing makes this book feel like a collective approach that invites the reader to join and mimics the goals of social justice pedagogy in its delivery.
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