CHAPTER 15.

TOWARD A MORE HUMAN APPROACH TO ASSESSMENT

Jathan Day
University of Alaska Anchorage

Naitnaphit Limlamai
Colorado State University

Emily Wilson
Alfaisal University

As scholars who study students' writing and design assessments to develop their writing skills and support their conceptual learning, we often take for granted how writing facilitates that learning. And while Robert Bangert-Drowns and colleagues found that "writing can be expected to enhance learning in academic settings, … it is not a potent magic" (53). Paul Anderson and colleagues' study of the effects of writing-to-learn activities on student learning explored how to make writing more potent as a learning tool. The authors identified that "writing assignments that involve the three constructs of Interactive Writing Processes, Meaning-Making Writing Tasks, and Clear Writing Expectations enhance undergraduate students' participation in Deep Approaches to Learning…" (231).

Building on Anderson et al.'s study, Anne Ruggles Gere and collaborators added a fourth feature, metacognition, to help explicate *what* about writing leads to learning gains ("Writing"). Table 15.1 defines and offers examples of each feature of effective writing assessment design.

Gere et al.'s study echoes Bangert-Drowns et al.'s findings that writing, on its own, doesn't necessarily lead to gains in learning and that other elements of the task matter: "measurement of learning matters, implementation matters, the richness of each of the four components matters, and the meaning assigned to writing matters" (Gere et al., "Writing" 123). It is not merely the presence of the four features that matters for writing assessment but also the quality of each feature's inclusion that determines their effectiveness in helping students learn by writing. The meanings we assign to writing when we incorporate the four features of effective assessment design maintain writing as a cognitive and sociocultural process.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2025.2456.2.15

Table 15.1. Characteristics of Four Features of Effective Writing Assessment Design

Interactive Writing Processes	• Definition: having "student writers communicate orally or in writing with one or more persons … between receiving an assignment and submitting the final draft" (Anderson et al. 206). • Examples: working with fellow students while planning and writing drafts, peer review, and conferences with the instructor • Of note: Of all the features of effective writing assessment, Gere et al. found that interactive processes were the least included feature ("Writing").
Meaning-Making Writing Tasks	• Definition: "requir[ing] students to engage in some form of integrative, critical, or original thinking" (Anderson et al. 207) • Examples: making connections between the work of the current class and past experiences or other classes, "support[ing] a contestable claim with evidence, or evaluat[ing] a policy, practice, or position" (207)
Clear Expectations	• Definition: instructors offering students a way to "understand … what they are asking … students to show that they can do in an assignment" and making evident "the criteria by which … instructors will evaluate" student work (Anderson et al. 207) • Examples: instructors providing students with an assignment sheet and rubric, or instructors and students creating a rubric together
Metacognition	• Definition: "thinking about thinking"; "promot[ing] planning, monitoring, evaluating, and adapting cognitive strategies during the process of learning" (Bangert-Drowns et al. 32). This kind of thinking helps learners "deploy cognitive strategies flexibly and in novel contexts" (32). Metacognition also "includes planning, monitoring, evaluating, and adapting cognitive strategies" as learners develop new ideas (Gere et al., "Writing" 105). • Examples: reflecting on decision-making processes entailed in a writing assignment; examining classmates' work to see their understanding of the assignment and concepts evaluated via the assignment

While Gere et al.'s study on analysis of assignments focused on writing-to-learn pedagogies in the sciences, this chapter extends the four features of effective assessment design to facilitate student learning in the writing and education classes we teach. We draw on our work studying with Gere the four features while we were in the Joint Program in English and Education (JPEE) at the University of Michigan, which she directed during our time in graduate school there. In this chapter we are applying what we learned with Gere across platforms (from in-person to online), across cultures (from the United States to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia), and across disciplines (from writing studies

to education). We explore what happens when we take features of assessment design and put them to work in contexts that make a variety of demands on our assessments as we seek to further humanize approaches to writing assessment. True to the ethos of JPEE, we approach this work as interdisciplinary scholars reaching across and attending to multiple fields, contexts, and student needs to build on the foundations Gere has helped construct.

Within this chapter, Jathan Day argues for a more intentional approach to interactive writing processes via online peer review that underscores the human and professional needs of students. His section presses scholars in writing studies to expand upon our understanding of interactivity, as Gere et al. suggest ("Writing"), by examining peer review and other points of human contact in the writing process.

Emily Wilson extends our understanding of what it means for a writing task to make meaning. First, she examines how a writing prompt can leverage students' aspirations. Then, she conveys how those aspirations are culturally specific, comparing how aspiration might be defined in a U.S. versus an Arab context. This knowledge helped her and her team redesign writing prompts for first-year composition students in Saudi Arabia that were more meaningful than previously because the meaning making was culturally specific.

Naitnaphit Limlamai joins metacognitive practices from writing studies and education to explore how reflection can facilitate preservice teachers' learning of how to disrupt the reproduction of white supremacy in secondary English language arts classrooms. Explicitly justice-oriented and racially conscious metacognition can support preservice teachers' learning about making teaching decisions that allow all students to thrive and that facilitate instructors' design of student learning.

JATHAN DAY: A MORE INTENTIONAL APPROACH TO INTERACTIVE WRITING PROCESSES

During the COVID-19 pandemic, while my colleagues were in the throes of learning to teach online and navigating the ever-shifting terrain of health and safety, I thought a lot about student interaction. As a writing instructor with a background in online pedagogy, one site of interaction that continues to elude me is peer review. The pandemic seems to have triggered a paradigm shift in how students and instructors interact with one another online; it feels so much harder these days to share written work with others, let alone ask questions and offer feedback. Perhaps it is harder to trust in the process of online peer review because many students who suddenly shifted to virtual formats during the pandemic perceived the quality of online instruction as inferior to that of

a face-to-face (F2F) classroom (Nelson and Vee). Perhaps socioeconomic and psychological stressors (Pasquini and Keeter) have intensified the pressure of interacting with one another—even online.

I teach for an institution that has offered online courses since before the pandemic began, and while many students are eager to interact, a significant number experience challenges connecting during peer review—not posting drafts, not knowing what to write or say in response to another draft, or not being present in the process at all—making this critical component of writing assessment appear like a checklist of hurdles rather than a shared writing experience. Another challenge is when students *do* participate but do not hear or receive anything from their group members. Thus, the problem remains clear: how can writing instructors make online peer review assessments more inviting, human experiences when disconnection has become so prevalent, or even preferable?

Interaction is an important yet understudied part of the writing process (Gere et al., "Writing"), and while many scholars have addressed students' online interactions (e.g., King; Phan et al.), online peer review requires further examination. Some scholars, such as Anderson et al., suggest that interaction in writing comprises the exposure that students' drafts receive before submission, yet, despite the learning opportunities this exposure brings, many students remain resistant to the idea of peer review (Kaufman and Schunn), so how can we help our online students recognize the value of peer review when interaction itself is the challenge? How can we help students recognize the work that peer review does in building rapport and establishing human connection? And, perhaps most importantly, how might we enhance online peer review to counteract the ongoing social and educational effects of the recent global pandemic? Arguably the most pressing charge we face is helping online writing students develop confidence in their ability to offer feedback to their peers and evaluate the feedback they receive. While putting students into groups may go some distance in facilitating this process, students also require opportunities to *practice* peer review.

Students' resistance to online peer review, regardless of format, is not a new phenomenon—and students have good reasons for resisting it. In a study comparing peer review in F2F and online contexts, Ruie Jane Pritchard and Donna Morrow found that students perceive F2F peer review as a more generative space for exchanging feedback (98) and noted that students tended not to engage with their peers' questions when posted in an online format (97). Other scholars, such as Michael John Wilson and colleagues, suggest that issues of fairness, labor, and time may impact the success of online peer review, especially when writing instructors introduce a specific tool for peer review. In their study of the Moodle Workshop tool, Wilson et al. also indicate that student confusion about technology can hamper productive peer review sessions (25). Such studies raise

questions, understandably, about the rules and procedures around online peer review. Although writing studies scholars appear to affirm that building rules into online peer review can increase its chances of success, the often procedural nature of rules may be taxing for students (and writing instructors) and leave little space for the kinds of human interaction present in F2F peer review. In considering a more human approach to online peer review, I turn to Gere's work.

Much of Gere's most recent research has been situated in the study of STEM writing (see Gere et al., "Writing"), but Gere's work in this area has inspired me to think about how intradisciplinarity might foster more productive communication during online peer review. In a reflection on how writing courses are now conventionally structured in higher education, Gere explains that "students' writerly growth [is] directly linked to their developing mastery of a discipline's content, methods, genres, and epistemologies" ("Ways" 140), but she found that about half of the students at her institution sought to develop their writing skills in courses *outside* of the writing program. Perhaps, then, creating opportunities for students to review the work of others in their fields might reinforce content knowledge and help them develop confidence in their interactions with others around related topics.

I find Gere's approach to writing assessment important to online peer review for two reasons. First, students who enter into online peer review for the first time often struggle to find common ground and language because they are removed from the close contact that they would otherwise experience in F2F classes. As a result, students may focus more on figuring out how peer review is supposed to operate rather than what they can learn from the experiences of their peers (or what discipline-specific writing skills they might glean). Second, we ask students to invest time and energy in their peers' work when they review it, so asking students to engage in this process with some context for the writing they might do in their own fields could give this investment a bit more purpose and direction. In addition to putting students into field-specific groups, it seems equally important to teach students about how they might network and build collegiality by learning about similar content knowledge and genre features *together*. Even if students do not claim a particular field, they can still learn about writing moves and genre conventions from students who do. After all, this is one of many activities that writing groups do.

Gere's work also teaches us that how we frame peer review matters. In her book *Writing Groups: History, Theory, and Implications*, Gere argues for a more comprehensive approach that considers both the solitary and social dimensions of writing. While Gere's book addresses these dimensions in face-to-face contexts, I draw from her work here to emphasize the social dimension in framing peer review for online students: how to ask good questions of peers' writing, how

to engage with feedback, and how to develop rapport with others through the sharing of writing. And, in the spirit of gathering at the table, writing instructors in online courses might frame this assessment by sharing more of their own peer writing experiences with students. I have been part of many in-person and online writing groups, so perhaps I could do more to share the human elements of that experience (e.g., the vulnerability of sharing and talking about others' work; considering others' feedback in isolation). Sharing these experiences may better situate peer review within the writing process and show, particularly to online students, how this social dimension can help them strengthen their writing and their communication *about* it.

Ultimately, online writing instructors are uniquely positioned to support students' interactions during peer review by making connections to personal interests (building rapport with their peers) and professional interests (networking and building repertoires of shared language and genres). And although peer review will likely remain a contested activity among students, the research of scholars such as Gere illuminates two important takeaways: (1) students require more context for the professional and intradisciplinary value of sharing writing with others, and (2) students in online courses might benefit from more framing—and, indeed, more *argument*—of how peer review can help them compose the writing that matters to them. Moving forward, we should more closely examine interaction in writing groups and how conversations about writing can take place productively in the absence of physical (or temporal) presence.

EMILY WILSON: MAKING MEANING ACROSS CULTURES BY WORKING ASPIRATION INTO FIRST-YEAR WRITING

The English department curriculum committee of which I am a member was overhauling first-year writing at Alfaisal University in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. We surveyed copies of writing assignments spread across a long table. The first prompt asked students to "[w]rite an essay comparing and contrasting your parents' attitude toward punctuality with your own attitude toward punctuality." Students were struggling to respond to these prompts, shoehorning tortured language into formulaic essays. How could we rewrite these assignments in ways that would better develop our students' writing skills? What factors, beyond a grade, could help motivate students to produce more meaningful writing?

I recalled another day at another long table in Anne Gere's office. There were writing prompts spread across that table too, as well as student responses. We were researching MWrite, the University of Michigan's writing-to-learn (WTL) program. Students had written assignments for a chemistry course, and Gere led our research team in analyzing why students had scored higher on

one assignment than another. The prompt with lower-scoring responses asked students to explain a chemistry concept to their grandparents in an email. The prompt with the higher-scoring responses had the students act as a consultant for a Tour de France cycling team and offer a chemistry-informed decision about the team's diet.

Gere had us apply Anderson et al.'s characteristics of good writing assignments, and meaning-making activities seemed especially salient. The cycling-team prompt invited students to envision themselves in an aspirational role; the email to grandparents, while specific in its audience, lacked aspirational qualities. Anderson et al. "found that students need opportunities to make meaning with their writing and to engage in critical thinking" (207). In the article we wrote about those students' responses, we found that "[h]ow easily students can make meaning within the constraints of a WTL assignment depends on several factors, among them … aspiration. To what extent does the imagined rhetorical situation of the writing prompt tap into students' aspirations?" (Gere et al., "Tale" 163). Our findings intersected with those of Michele Eodice and her colleagues, who also connected student aspirations and meaningful writing. We discovered that "the more aspirational qualities that were present in a prompt, the easier it was for students' uptake to demonstrate effective meaning making" (Gere et al., "Tale" 163).

Back at the table in Riyadh, I thought about what I had learned about writing prompts with Gere in 2018. Although this was not a WTL situation, I considered rewriting our prompts to include more aspirational elements. But as our committee pondered the question, we realized that, as Western faculty members, tapping into our Arab students' aspirations would also necessitate us learning more about their cultures.

Aspiration involves culturally rooted conceptions of success, desire, and ambition. At Michigan, we were conceptualizing aspiration in culturally specific ways. We assumed that students were primarily motivated by individual success, focused "outward" on a future job rather than "inward" on their roots and communities. Conversations with my Arab students taught me that they construct "aspiration" more communally than I do. It meant more than envisioning themselves in prestigious future roles; it also meant connecting themselves to familial, local, or even national interests. If we were to revise these prompts to account for our students' understandings of aspiration, we needed to adopt a culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings; Capper) that drew on students' funds of knowledge (Gonzalez et al.). We needed to craft assignments that "connected meaningfully to [students'] lifeworld locales: in effect, putting students to work as 'researchers' of their own lifeworlds" (Zipin 320). Our goal was to challenge students to "creat[e] innovations—new funds of knowledge—to stimulate a

rethinking of the present and considerations of future possibilities" (Moll 133). With these ideas in mind, we rewrote the first prompt:

> You have been hired as a youth consultant for the Ministry of Tourism. Write a memo to the Chair of the Saudi Commission for Tourism and National Heritage explaining 2-3 activities here in Riyadh that would appeal to tourists in the 18-25 demographic.

This prompt invited students to connect their cultural heritage to their country's ambitions and centered their expertise in the target demographic. It envisioned students contributing toward national goals of increasing tourism and changing perceptions of Saudi Arabia.

While future studies will measure improvements more systematically, our faculty witnessed more engaged student writing in passages like these:

> Saudi traditions are rooted in Islamic teachings and Arab customs. Notably, the highlights of the year are … Ramadan and the Hajj season, and the national holidays that follow them. During these holidays Saudis serve Arabic coffee in small cups along with dates and sweets as a hospitality gesture. This could be a meaningful learning experience for college-aged tourists, in addition to trying to fast during Ramadan. Because I am a college-aged student, I know how interesting it is for people in the same age demographic as me to experience new cultures! (Aljohara[1])

Aljohara is using her cultural knowledge (González et al.) to highlight experiences that tourists might enjoy and to educate a foreign audience about the "Islamic teachings and Arab customs" in which those cultural experiences are rooted. She is writing to change people's perceptions of her country. And she is connecting her audience's interests to her own as a member of the same demographic.

Similarly, Felwa works to "make and extend personal connections to [her] experiences" (Eodice et al. 320):

> [C]ollege students would be fond of Saudi Arabia's annual National Heritage Festival, where cultural heritage is celebrated. I met one of my favorite poets, Rashed AlNufaie, at this festival. … In view of the fact that students spend most of their time studying, it's absolutely delightful to listen to a few verses of a poem to loosen up a little.

1 Pseudonyms are used for all student names in this chapter.

Felwa uses her knowledge of student life (i.e., "students spend most of their time studying") to write from a place of authority (Whitney). Saudi students have often told me of their frustration that the "single story" (Adichie) of their country is so negative, while the beautiful aspects of their culture are overlooked. This prompt invited them to challenge the single story; it "embraced an orientation to student writing … that truly capitalize[d] on the experiences, beliefs, and aspirations students bring to their learning" (Eodice et al. 320).

Before we, as Western faculty members, could create more meaningful writing assignments, we had to learn from students what kinds of cultural knowledge they were bringing to the table. From Gere, I learned the importance of aspiration in helping create meaning-making activities in writing. From my Saudi students, I learned to interrogate my own cultural assumptions about what is aspirational.

NAITNAPHIT LIMLAMAI: RACIALLY CONSCIOUS, JUSTICE-ORIENTED METACOGNITION

"I feel like I've learned what not to do. I'm hoping this class teaches me what to do." I receive lots of notes with this sentiment on preservice teachers' (PSTs) precourse surveys before our Methods for Teaching Language Arts class. Despite their desire to learn, PSTs in the United States are often "dysconscious" (Sleeter 559) of how racism works and how it is reproduced in schools (Chapman; Sleeter), specifically through decisions teachers make, such as text selection, pedagogical strategies, or assessments of student learning. Routinized teaching decisions that allow institutions like schools to function efficiently reproduce anti-Blackness and white supremacy, solidifying a racial structure (Bonilla-Silva; Diamond and Gomez).

To combat this pernicious reproduction of racism and white supremacy, educational scholars have suggested an array of self-reflective heuristics and activities for teachers that can help them recognize how their racialized identities function in the classroom. These strategies include conducting an archeology of self (Mentor and Sealey-Ruiz; Sealey-Ruiz, "Archaeology"), becoming interrupters (Perry et al.), and examining self and classroom practice via the five culturally and historically responsive pursuits: identity, skills, intellect, criticality, and joy (Muhammad). What these self-reflective activities have in common is the process—via metacognitive reflection—of excavating, questioning, letting go, and replacing dysfunctional racialized beliefs about students.

The process of self-reflection engages learners in metacognition: monitoring their learning as they work through ideas presented to them, recording their (affective) reactions, and tracking the development of new ideas. Metacognitive

practices in writing-to-learn pedagogies and metacognitive practices to develop racial literacy (Sealey-Ruiz, "Learning") conceptualize writing as a sociocultural practice where knowledge is socially constructed and mediated by the contexts in which the writer writes (Gere et al., "Writing"; Rodriguez), rather than holding writing as an activity that simply promotes recall or algorithmic thinking.

In studying the efficacy of WTL pedagogies, researchers have found that metacognition is a key feature of effective assessment design. Meta-analyses of WTL assignments conducted by Bangert-Drowns et al. and Gere et al. ("Writing") show that assignments that ask learners to "evaluate their current understandings, confusions, and feelings in relation to the subject matter yielded more positive effects than instruction that did not include such metacognitive stimulation" (Bangert-Drowns et al. 47). Writing about content alone does not necessarily yield learning gains. Asking learners to engage in metacognitive practices that allow them to reflect on their learning and learning processes—including moments of understanding and confusion—is an integral component of learning.

As a researcher and teacher who moves between the fields of English and education, I consider how ideas about metacognition drawn from writing studies can join ideas drawn from education to disrupt the reproduction of white supremacy in secondary English language arts classrooms. In our methods class, we first surface and interrogate ideas about English class and what goes on there, as well as how those ideas have been shaped by our intersectional socialized identities (Crenshaw). Then, we draw on culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings), culturally responsive (Gay), and culturally sustaining (Paris and Alim) pedagogies to co-construct definitions and enactments of justice-oriented teaching (Gorski; Limlamai), creating a working rubric to guide the building of teaching artifacts (i.e., lesson plans, unit plans, classroom activities) and practice teaching sessions. Throughout our class, PSTs use their writing to spur metacognitive reflection on their previous ideas about teaching and their development of new ideas in pursuing justice-oriented teaching practices.

While Bangert-Drowns and Gere et al. ("Writing") specifically examine metacognition within writing-to-learn pedagogies, I argue that drawing on ideas of metacognition and extending them to explicitly justice-oriented and racially conscious metacognition can support preservice teachers' learning about their teaching decisions, specifically by offering opportunities for PSTs to ask questions and clarify confusions and unpack their feelings about new ideas.

Ask Questions and Clarify Confusions

Right after we developed our justice-oriented teaching rubric, students offered reflections on how their identities and experiences in English class affected how

they might imagine their own English classrooms. Examining our rubric, Faegan specifically noted how she "want[ed] to improve on disruption in our discipline." To disrupt, she first recognized how her own experiences "in high school and, until recent semesters, college[,] focused on the canon of English works and the typical teaching of them." Then, she brainstormed how in her teaching her own English class could be different: despite the possibility of assigning the same novels she read, she "want[ed] to be able to take those novels that never stretch or challenge students' thinking and do the opposite of what I had so many times." In her reflections, Faegan identified the ways things have been done and wanted to change them. The question was how.

One way Faegan wanted to try entailed expanding the narrative. She wanted to use her "knowledge of the typical traumatic narratives of the oppressed and the power dynamic of history," but to also build units and lessons that helped students to know "joy … and complexity in power." This tension actualized as we developed the unit for our partner eighth-grade class and discussed what background information to share with the eighth graders about Jewish people before reading Elie Wiesel's *Night.* In her reflection as we built the unit, Faegan wondered, "I'm not sure how much connection to make for the students with the [H]olocaust and what I should include and what just perpetuates the trauma narrative." Faegan's justice-oriented reflections reveal how she was grappling with building students' knowledge of the Holocaust and also not allowing the story of Jewish people to only be trauma-centered.

Faegan's justice-oriented reflections helped her surface questions and conveyed to me her developing understandings about her identities and how her previous learning had narrowed her view of the world. I then used her reflections as a formative assessment and helped her build knowledge about where to start in building our unit for the eighth graders.

Unpack Feelings about New Ideas

Another PST's new learning entailed developing insights into his own whiteness, how this intersected with his existing ideas, and how new ideas might shape his teaching. After Brigg told me that his whiteness was inconsequential to him and that he did not see himself as white, I had him learn more about white supremacy and reflect on that learning. After listening to the first couple of episodes of the podcast *Seeing White* and developing the unit for our eighth-grade partner class, he wrote, "I think that tradition, and personal issues are the biggest factors in preventing me from engaging in justice[-]oriented practice. Not having [them] be a part of many classes which use justice[-]oriented practice leads to me having a lack of experience to draw on, and I fall back on

the habits of the teachers I have examples from." He identified systemic reasons for his difficulty and was vague in identifying "personal issues" that were blocking his learning. After more listening and doing his own research, however, he recognized the obstruction: "I'd lived my whole life without actually looking at anything I was seeing, never facing down the hard truths of reality; that I was surrounded by injustice." Brigg's reflections revealed that he was developing a recognition of how his whiteness allowed him to look without seeing.

Like his classmates, Brigg's racially conscious and justice-oriented reflections surfaced knowledge that had been hidden from him—by design—throughout their schooling. In Brigg's case, he was transformed when he learned about and confronted the origins and reproduction of white supremacy and his implicit role in that reproduction. Brigg, like Faegan, wrote that he didn't have models of justice-oriented teaching in his classrooms, and thus drew from limited models to shape his teaching. Brigg loved school and found solace in English class, particularly as a student who faced poverty and experienced housing insecurity as a secondary student. Brigg's new learning about white supremacy could have backfired—he could have become fragile (DiAngelo) because I was asking him to interrogate ways he defined himself; he could have shut down. I thus used his reflections to learn how he was feeling and taking up ideas of white supremacy. I also then planned questions I might ask to further his learning and recommend additional resources. For example, I asked how his new understandings of his own whiteness might shape his teaching, particularly in his decisions about which texts to center in the classroom.

Conclusion

Preservice teachers' justice-oriented metacognition facilitated their transformative thinking about teaching and revealed to me, their instructor, how to plan for their continued learning. James Baldwin wrote, "Not everything that is faced can be changed; but nothing can be changed until it is faced" (148). In order to make changes so that schooling is transformed from being a racist institution, we must face and assess our current understandings of schooling and what goes on there (Diamond and Gomez), specifically as it interacts with our intersectional socialized identities (Mentor and Sealey-Ruiz; Perry et al.; Sealey-Ruiz, "Archaeology"). Justice-oriented metacognitive reflections offer a way for PSTs to face their understandings of schooling, themselves, the world, and how that knowledge shapes their teaching. As PSTs build their capacity for reflection, research has shown that they will get better at it and internalize a "self-reflective posture" (Bangert-Drowns et al. 52).

CLOSING THOUGHTS

As Hammond offers in his chapter in this collection, how we position assessment in institutional contexts matters. In line with that cue, our chapter has positioned three features of effective writing design—interactive writing processes, meaning-making writing tasks, and metacognition—in our specific contexts with specific student needs, continuing Gere et al.'s work of extension ("Writing"). Taken together, surfacing, learning about, addressing, and engaging in students' needs are at the heart of our work as instructors. By learning about students' needs and perspectives, we can humanize assessment, making it a tool that better prepares students "for the actual lives that await them" (Gere, "Presidential Address" 457).

WORKS CITED

Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi. "The Danger of a Single Story." *TED: Ideas Change Everything*, July 2009, https://tinyurl.com/mrve4tx9.

Anderson, Paul, et al. "The Contributions of Writing to Learning and Development: Results from a Large-Scale Multi-Institutional Study." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 50, 2015, pp. 199–235, https://doi.org/10.58680/rte201527602.

Baldwin, James. "As Much Truth as One Can Bear." *The New York Times*, 14 Jan. 1962, pp. 120, 148, https://tinyurl.com/5xrrdukv.

Bangert-Drowns, Robert L., et al. "The Effects of School-Based Writing-to-Learn Interventions on Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis." *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 74, no. 1, 2004, pp. 29–58, https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001029.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. "The Structure of Racism in Color-Blind, 'Post-Racial' America." *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 59, no. 11, 2015, pp. 1358–76, https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764215586826.

Capper, Kelley. "Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in the English Curriculum." *Journal of Education*, vol. 202, no. 4, 2022, pp. 397–405, https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057421991856.

Chapman, Thandeka K. "You Can't Erase Race! Using CRT to Explain the Presence of Race and Racism in Majority White Suburban Schools." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2013, pp. 611–27, https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2013.822619.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 43, no. 6, 1991, pp. 1241–99. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039.

Diamond, John B., and Louis M. Gomez. "Disrupting White Supremacy and Anti-Black Racism in Educational Organizations." *Educational Researcher*, Online First, 2023, https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X231161054.

DiAngelo, Robin. *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard for White People to Talk about Racism*. Beacon P, 2018.

Eodice, Michele, et al. "The Power of Personal Connection for Undergraduate Student Writers." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2019, pp. 320–39. *St. John's Scholar*, https://scholar.stjohns.edu/english_facpubs/2/.

Gay, Geneva. "Preparing for Culturally Responsive Teaching." *Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 53, no. 2, 2002, pp. 106–16, https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053002003.

Gere, Anne Ruggles, editor. *Developing Writers in Higher Education*. U of Michigan P, 2019. *University of Michigan Press Ebook Collection*, https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.10079890.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. "Presidential Address—Re-visioning Language, Texts, and Theories." *PMLA*, vol. 134, no. 3, 2019, pp. 450–58. *Cambridge Core*, https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2019.134.3.450.

---. "The Ways Our Students Write Now." *PMLA,* vol. 133, no. 1, 2018, pp. 139–45. *Cambridge Core*, https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.139.

---. *Writing Groups: History, Theory, and Implications.* Southern Illinois UP, 1987.

Gere, Anne Ruggles, et al. "A Tale of Two Prompts: New Perspectives on Writing-to-Learn Assignments." *The WAC Journal,* vol. 29, 2018, pp. 147–88, https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2018.29.1.07/.

Gere, Anne Ruggles, et al. "Writing and Conceptual Learning in Science: An Analysis of Assignments." *Written Communication*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2019, pp. 99–135 https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088318804820.

González, Norma, et al. *Funds of Knowledge: Theorizing Practices in Households, Communities, and Classrooms*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2005. *Taylor and Francis eBooks*, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410613462.

Gorski, Paul C. "What We're Teaching Teachers: An Analysis of Multicultural Teacher Education Coursework Syllabi." *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2009, pp. 309–18, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.07.008.

Kaufman, Julia H., and Christian D. Schunn. "Students' Perceptions about Peer Assessment for Writing: Their Origin and Impact on Revision Work." *Instructional Science*, vol. 39, no. 3, 2011, pp. 387–406, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-010-9133-6.

King, Stephanie B. "Graduate Student Perceptions of the Use of Online Course Tools to Support Engagement." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* vol. 8, no. 1, 2014, digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol8/iss1/5/.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. "But That's Just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy." *Theory into Practice*, vol. 34, no. 3, 1995, pp. 159–65, https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849509543675.

Limlamai, Naitnaphit. "Complexities of Justice-Oriented Teaching." *English Journal*, vol. 112, no. 5, 2023, pp. 22–28, https://doi.org/10.58680/ej202332417.

Mentor, Marcelle, and Yolanda Sealey-Ruiz. "Doing the Deep Work of Antiracist Pedagogy: Toward Self-Excavation for Equitable Classroom Teaching." *Language Arts*, vol. 99, no. 1, 2021, pp. 19–24, https://doi.org/10.58680/la202131410.

Moll, Luis C. "Elaborating Funds of Knowledge: Community-Oriented Practices in International Contexts." *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, vol. 68, no. 1, 2019, pp. 130–38, https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336919870805.

Muhammad, Gholdy. *Unearthing Joy: A Guide to Culturally and Historically Responsive Teaching and Learning*. Scholastic, 2023.

Nelson, S. L., and Annette Vee. "The View from 'Zoom University': Surveillance and Control in Higher Ed's Pandemic Pedagogy Pivot." *enculturation*, vol. 34, 2022, enculturation.net/zoom_university.

Paris, Django, and H. Samy Alim. "What Are We Seeking to Sustain through Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy? A Loving Critique Forward." *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 84, no. 1, 2014, pp. 85–100, https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.982l873k2ht16m77.

Pasquini, Giancarlo, and Scott Keeter. "At Least Four-in-Ten U.S. Adults Have Faced High Levels of Psychological Distress During COVID-19 Pandemic." *Pew Research Center*, 12 Dec. 2022, https://tinyurl.com/3jxvsdty.

Perry, Tonya B., et al. *Teaching for Racial Equity: Becoming Interrupters*. Stenhouse Publishers, 2022. *Taylor and Francis eBooks*, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032682679.

Phan, Trang, et al. "Students' Patterns of Engagement and Course Performance in a Massive Open Online Course." *Computers and Education,* vol. 95, 2016, pp. 36–44, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.015.

Pritchard, Ruie Jane, and Donna Morrow. "Comparison of Online and Face-to-Face Peer Review of Writing." *Computers and Composition*, vol. 46, 2017, pp. 87–103, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2017.09.006.

Rodriguez, Alberto J. "Strategies for Counterresistance: Toward Sociotransformative Constructivism and Learning to Teach Science for Diversity and for Understanding." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, vol. 35, no. 6, 1998, pp. 589–622, https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199808)35:6%3C589::AID-TEA2%3E3.0.CO;2-I.

Sealey-Ruiz, Yolanda. "An Archaeology of Self for Our Times: Another Talk to Teachers." *English Journal*, vol. 111, no. 5, 2022, pp. 21–26, https://doi.org/10.58680/ej202231819.

---. "Learning to Talk and Write about Race: Developing Racial Literacy in a College English Classroom." *English Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2011, pp. 24–42.

Seeing White. Scene on Radio, 2024, sceneonradio.org/seeing-white/.

Sleeter, Christine E. "Preparing White Teachers for Diverse Students." *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts*, 3rd ed., edited by Marilyn Cochran-Smith et al., Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group / Association of Teacher Educators, 2008.

Whitney, Anne Elrod. "'I Just Turned in What *I* Thought': Authority and Voice in Student Writing." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2011, pp. 184–93, https://doi.org/10.58680/tetyc201118384.

Wiesel, Elie. *Night*. Hill and Wang, 2006.

Wilson, Michael John, et al. "'I'm not here to mark someone else's stuff': An Investigation of an Online Peer-to-Peer Review Workshop Tool." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2015, pp. 15–32, https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.881980.

Zipin, Lew "Dark Funds of Knowledge, Deep Funds of Pedagogy: Exploring Boundaries between Lifeworlds and Schools." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, vol. 30, no. 3, 2009, pp. 317–31, https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300903037044.