Raciolinguistic Justice in College Literacy and Learning: A Call for Reflexive Praxis

A White Paper prepared for the
College Reading and Learning Association

Emily K. Suh, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Texas State University
Jeanine L. Williams, Department of Arts and Humanities, University of Maryland Global Campus
Sam Owens, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Texas State University

CRLA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This white paper, commissioned by the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA), examines the interconnected role of race and language in college literacy and learning contexts. Throughout the paper, we, the authors, intentionally use first-person language to challenge the assumption that frank discussions about race and language can be removed from ourselves as language users. Indeed, we call upon our readers in recognizing that systemic change cannot occur without first acknowledging each of our roles in birthing that change. This white paper serves as an initial step in this work: We examine multiple related theories and pedagogical practices that demonstrate a focus on race and language and offer concrete practices to support raciolinguistic justice for racially minoritized members of the academic community. The paper focuses on the following key areas:

- Reflexive examination of language and race in college literacy and learning

- A call for raciolinguistic justice

- Raciolinguistic perspectives in theory and action

- Jeanine Williams' Framework for Raciolinguistically Just Literacy Instruction

The white paper begins with a discussion of raciolinguistics as a framework for understanding the interconnected nature of race and language in college teaching and learning support. We offer a brief overview of scholarship that centers on racial and linguistic justice within U.S. higher education contexts. We then describe theoretically driven and research-informed *wise practices* for raciolinguistic justice in college teaching and learning support. Like many of our other language choices in this white paper, we intentionally use the phrase "wise practice" to amplify the knowledge of racially minoritized scholars. Brian Calliou and Cynthia Wesley-Esquimaux (2010) described wise practices as "locally-appropriate actions, tools, principles or decisions that contribute significantly to the development of sustainable and equitable conditions" (p. 19) as compared to the term *best practices*, which offers a hegemonizing and decontextualized framing of model or exemplary practices. In our discussion of wise practices, we describe raciolinguistic justice as existing at the heart of critical language awareness and antiracist education, and we introduce readers to a range of wise practices which may be adapted and adopted in other college contexts to elevate and celebrate students' diverse voices and ways of using language.

Throughout this document, we, the authors, amplify the voices of raciolinguistically minoritized practitioners and scholars, and we intentionally introduce these scholarly mentors and ancestors by using their first and last names. In this white paper, we also draw upon the following terminology: *equity, inclusion, justice, raciolinguistic justice, raciolinguistics, racism, standard English, white language supremacy, white supremacy,* and *whiteness*. Please refer to Appendix A for full definitions and references for further reading on these terms.

This white paper serves as a springboard for deeper engagement, on both scholarly and practical levels, with raciolinguistic justice. Indeed, this white paper is the first to explicate the connection between raciolinguistics and justice. As the authors, our ultimate goal is that this white paper will spur the widespread commitment and action necessary to dismantle white supremacist systems within higher education and make raciolinguistic justice a reality in college literacy and learning. We acknowledge that attaining this goal requires intentional, sustained work towards ideological, cultural, and systems-level change within postsecondary literacy and learning. As such, we have designed this white paper to facilitate the required ideological, cultural, and systemic shift.

Introduction

Although most of the conversation on language in postsecondary literacy and learning spaces is framed within the construct of linguistic diversity, we, as the authors of this white paper, choose to frame our discussion of literacy and language within the construct of raciolinguistic justice. Linguistic diversity is a widely accepted and useful framework in that it brings to light the diverse ways in which languages and literacies are constructed and practiced. However, this framework is inadequate in that it too often focuses exclusively on students for whom English is an additional language, and it does not explicitly acknowledge linguistic diversity among students who speak English as a first language. At the same time, while the majority of us as postsecondary literacy educators take up the goal of linguistic diversity, we echo the concerns presented by Jeanine Williams (2021d) who describes a growing feeling among college literacy and learning professionals that we are ill-equipped to translate this ideal into meaningful and effective practice. Recently, for example, professionals in composition and rhetoric conferences and events have taken up such topics, but the resulting conversations have illuminated our inexperience and ill-preparation about *how* to effectively enact linguistically just practices in our

instruction (Williams, 2021d). It is thus unsurprising that "our curricular, pedagogical, and assessment structures do not fully reflect our commitment to linguistic diversity" (Williams, 2021d, p. 3).

At the same time, the construct of linguistic diversity does not do enough to illuminate—and more importantly, problematize—the racist and unjust language ideologies and systems that drive the curricular, pedagogical, and assessment practices in postsecondary education. As literacy and learning professionals work towards linguistic diversity, we often continue to subject our students to postsecondary literacy instruction and learning support that ignores and delegitimizes their linguistic realities and needs. Much worse, students who are Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC), in particular, continue to suffer from the ever-present linguistic violence and injustice in postsecondary literacy and learning spaces due to requirements to uphold *standard English*, "the glorification of linear thinking as clear thinking" (Williams, 2021d, p. 3), and class materials that deepen the invisibility of BIPOC students (Williams, 2021d; Young, 2020). As individuals with varying, intersectional marginalized identities, we have authored this, a white paper that stems from our embodied and enculturated awareness of the systemic race-based oppression that is interwoven into our postsecondary institutions.

Race substantially impacts the lived experiences, identities, and educational encounters of students of color (Allen, 2017; Brunsma, 2017; Doan, 2011; Nadal, 2014; Williams, 2013). Furthermore, students of color are more likely than their white counterparts to be placed into developmental education courses (Attewell et al., 2006; Bailey et al., 2010; Brathwaite & Edgecombe, 2018; Preston, 2017). Deeply rooted racial injustice and white supremacy continue to be revealed through new fissures within America's sociopolitical landscape. Within the field of postsecondary literacy and learning scholarship and practice, there are increasingly vocal demands for linguistic justice *now* (CCCC, 2020). At the heart of these demands is a rejection of white language supremacy that requires students to renounce their rich, powerful, and meaningful ways of communicating in order to conform to so-called standard English (Williams, 2021d).

The demand for linguistic justice leaves no space for false pedagogical compromises that appear to respect all students' right to their own language (like code-switching) while actually continuing to hold all students to a standard that honors certain ways of communicating (i.e., by adhering to a white language supremacist standard) while relegating other linguistic forms to the margins (Caldera & Babino, 2019, 2020; Howell, 2020; Inoue, 2019b, 2021; Williams, 2021d). Rather, as Williams (2021d) so aptly

noted, "The demand for linguistic justice unequivocally requires that students be taught from a critical language awareness paradigm, where they learn about the diversity of language and how to navigate and challenge the politics of language as writers" (p. 3; see also the section on p.14 of this document under the heading "What is Raciolinguistics and Why is It Relevant to College Literacy and Learning?"). Ultimately, postsecondary literacy and learning professionals endeavor to support students in developing the necessary linguistic dexterity to assertively, confidently, and freely apply their full linguistic repertoires (Williams, 2021d).

In this white paper, we offer a brief overview of scholarship which centers racial and linguistic justice in U.S. higher education contexts. We then describe *raciolinguistics* as a framework for understanding the interconnected nature of race and language in college teaching and learning support. We present literature on theoretically driven and research-informed wise practices for *raciolinguistic justice*, composed of critical language awareness and antiracist education. (Although there is some variation regarding the hyphen in "antiracism" and "antiracist," we have chosen not to hyphenate these terms unless we are quoting an author who uses a hyphen.) Finally, we introduce Jeanine Williams' Framework for Raciolinguistically Just Literacy Instruction (Williams, 2021d). Raciolinguistic justice demands more than a cursory engagement with these ideologies and systems. Instead, raciolinguistic justice offers a framework for deep and ongoing contemplation that moves us all, as postsecondary literacy professionals, past the safe haven of performative allyship. If we are serious about raciolinguistically just literacy instruction and learning support, then critical language awareness and antiracist education are essential to our individual and collective identities.

Throughout this document, we authors have made several intentional language choices that may stand out to our readers. First, we utilize first and second person language to signal our own personal responsibility and involvement in countering raciolinguistic injustice within higher education. Second, we switch between past tense to document the completed research findings of our fellow practitioner-scholars designing and examining raciolinguistically just practices in their classrooms and present tense to acknowledge the ongoing nature of this work and current relevance of their conclusions. Finally, we introduce practitioner-scholars of color by first and last name to elevate raciolinguistically minoritized voices from within our field. At times, this has meant the exclusion of white scholars with more citations or publications in more prestigious journals. However, in reviewing the literature for this white paper, we were heartened to note the number of

relevant articles in our field's leading publications, including the *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, the *Journal of Developmental Education*, and T*eaching English in the Two-Year College*, to name but a few.

It is our hope, as the authors, that this white paper will serve as a springboard for deeper engagement, both scholarly and practical, with raciolinguistic justice. Our ultimate goal is that this white paper will spur widespread commitment and the action necessary to make raciolinguistic justice a reality in college literacy and learning. We acknowledge that attaining this goal requires intentional, sustained work towards ideological, cultural, and systems-level change within postsecondary literacy and learning. As such we have designed this white paper to help facilitate the required shift.

Getting Started: A Call to Reflexivity

At the heart of work toward raciolinguistic justice is an unwavering acceptance of and reverence for the humanity and birthright of every individual—the right to exist without restraint and judgment. Language and literacy are essential expressions of this humanity and birthright; the ways in which language is used and literacy is practiced are windows into our lives and histories, our hopes and dreams. Language and literacy are about freedom and authenticity and sharing our voices, cultures, lives, loves, traditions, and futures. Indeed, language and literacy are opportunities to celebrate our diverse ways of knowing and doing and being. As Patricia Hill Collins (2000) pointed out,

> Oppressed groups are frequently placed in the situation of being listened to only if we frame our ideas in the language that is familiar to and comfortable for a dominant group. This requirement often changes the meaning of our ideas and works to elevate the ideas of dominant groups. (p. vii)

Thus, when a group's language and literacies are marginalized, or even worse, demonized, their humanity and birthright are essentially erased. This is too often the case in academic spaces, where racist ideals and linguistic injustice are deeply rooted and systemic.

The work of raciolinguistic justice cannot be reduced to a set of strategies to be implemented in a classroom or learning support center. While institutional and administrative support are essential to raciolinguistic justice, such efforts are also inadequate. Raciolinguistic justice—and justice of any kind—really must emerge from

systems change. Anything short of critically examining the larger system, identifying the policies and structures that perpetuate injustice, and intentionally and persistently working to build an equitable and just system will never result in the kind of change that acknowledges and reveres the humanity and birthright of the students and professionals who must operate within that system.

It is imperative to understand that the work of systems change can only be birthed through each person's own individual critically reflexive work. It is impossible to see or even imagine the necessary corrective actions for systems change if we cannot see our individual need for correction and change. We must constantly examine our own linguistic ideologies and the ways that they inextricably form and are formed by our racialized experiences within and outside of higher education. We must be able to acknowledge that "we too are products of an intentionally and persistently unjust educational system and society and that our ideas, teaching, and practice of literacy are tainted by our own experiences as students within this violent system" (Williams, 2021d, p. 4). This awareness and acknowledgement are a precondition to our ability to unlearn and decolonize our very imaginations so that we are free to reimagine and redesign our currently oppressive systems in order to best support our students (Williams, 2021d).

Thus, systems change for raciolinguistic justice requires a commitment to reflexivity. If positionality refers to what we as postsecondary literacy and learning educators (and members of the broader society) know and believe, then reflexivity is about what we do with this knowledge. Reflexivity involves questioning our own taken-for-granted assumptions and examining our feelings, reactions, and motives and how these influence what we think and do in a given situation. Reflexivity is an examination of our own beliefs, judgments, and practices during our teaching and assessment processes and an examination of how these may have influenced our teaching and assessment. As Williams (2021d) explained, "Reflexivity must be a perpetual habit of mind; it must be a disposition that drives our work for systems change and raciolinguistic justice" (p. 4).

In his work on antiracist reading practices, Asao Inoue (2020) offered a useful framework for engaging this kind of reflexivity. He explained that the act of reading itself can be used as an antiracist practice wherein readers are challenged to read mindfully, intentionally, and critically in order to think not just about the actual words of the text but also about how they arrived at their understanding of the text:

What social structures inform their personal ways of making sense of the text? In other words, what habits of language and judgment help a reader read a text, where did that reader get those habits, and where do those habits come from in the world? What do they do in the world, or to the reader, by being used? (p. 2)

Inoue further posited that readers must answer such questions in order to recognize their habits of language and the politics they engage in while reading or using language. This examination of our shared language habits is essential for doing "antiracist work by attending to the mind and language structures that structure us in a racist world" (Inoue, 2020, p. 2).

As you engage the information and ideas that follow, in order to fully absorb their transformative power, it is imperative that you read critically, mindfully, and reflexively. We encourage you to employ Inoue's (2020) antiracist reading framework by stopping periodically and working through the following steps:

> **PAUSE, BREATHE, REFLECT...**
> - **Breathe:** Pause for at least ten seconds and take three deep, slow breaths.
>
> - **Materials**: What details or words in this text seem to trigger an emotional response by me (good or bad)? Can I underline them?
>
> - **Habits**: What exactly am I feeling when I read these words, and how do the emotions manifest? Why am I so emotionally invested in my ideas or those that come up when I see these words?
>
> - **Origins**: What experiences, biases (ideas and values), or stake do I have that make these ideas so emotion-filled for me? Where did they come from in my life? (Inoue, 2020, p. 150)

Throughout this white paper, we remind readers of this reflexive stance by prompting you to **pause**, **breathe**, and **reflect**. We realize that the issues covered in this white paper are challenging and might evoke a myriad of reactions—many of which may feel negative. In light of this, we encourage you to be patient with yourself, to acknowledge your own humanity, and to give yourself space and grace as you work through this white paper. It is also important to note that reflective questions need not always evoke and involve negative thoughts and reactions. There may be places in your reading of this white paper that give you hope and joy. We encourage you to pause and savor these moments and allow them to encourage and strengthen you as you work through the more challenging aspects of this work.

What is Raciolinguistics and Why is it Relevant to College Literacy and Learning?

As literacy and learning educators, we see how students are expected to conform to ways of reading, writing, and thinking that do not reflect their existing linguistic knowledge and strengths. As literacy and learning scholars, we agree with Jonathan Rosa and Nelson Flores (2017) who describe how language and race have been "co-naturaliz[ed]" so that both are taken-for-granted ways to classify people (p. 621). In this section, we draw from relevant theorizations in order to present the argument that race and language are seen as synonymous in college literacy and learning contexts.

Discussion of racial justice and/in college literacy and learning must be predicated upon an understanding of the interconnectedness of race and language. Any efforts to enact racial justice in college literacy and learning must necessarily examine the ways that languages—and individuals' relationships with prescribed language standards—have been used for oppression and can similarly be used for emancipation. This white paper draws from explanations of raciolinguistics from scholars such as H. Samy Alim (2016), Geneva Smitherman (2017), and others (Rosa & Flores, 2017) to explore past and present ways that racialization occurs as "a process of socialization in and through language, as a continuous project of becoming as opposed to being" (Alim, 2016, p. 2). *Raciolinguistic enregisterment* refers to language and racial forms being collectively recognized as signs of natural sets. It is the process of "look[ing] like a language and sound[ing] like a race" (Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 631). Rosa and Flores (2017) describe how readers and listeners receive language and how their reading or listening can be traced back to racialized (and class-based) beliefs about language. In so doing, the authors describe raciolinguistics as a theory of "indexical inversion" (Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 628). This way of viewing race through the lens of language and language through the lens of race offers a theoretical framework for examining how race and language are co-naturalized, or uncritically assumed to go together, and then used to maintain racist practices in educational systems (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017).

Applied to college literacy and learning contexts, a raciolinguistics perspective explains how beliefs about race and language become a filter through which language use is heard and valued in classrooms, institutions, and society

at large. In particular, a raciolinguistics perspective gives us as college literacy and learning professionals a way to talk about how race becomes inextricably connected to language in postsecondary discussions about *standard, academic,* or *edited* language. A raciolinguistic framing asks us all to consider whether, when, and how certain language practices and forms are viewed as deviant even when they would be accepted or valued if demonstrated by white language producers. However, distilling raciolinguistics to a repudiation of racially based linguistic oppression fails to incorporate the recognition of language as linguistic resources which language users apply in their identity projections and processes (Alim, 2016; Smitherman, 2017).

Rosa and Flores (2017) highlight the need to redirect attention from "standard English" and the hearer/receiver of that language to the speaker's language skills and practices as having inherent communicative worth. This recentering on the student is key to the critical language awareness and antiracist pedagogies discussed later in this white paper. In wider institutional contexts, it also underlies the focus from college-ready students to student-ready colleges. Before exploring specific pedagogical practices, however, we first briefly introduce past efforts and the need for continued action to enact raciolinguistic justice in college literacy and learning contexts.

As you read the following section on professional statements and (un)official positions of CRLA and other organizations supporting college literacy and learning professionals, we implore you to examine these organizations and your membership in them with a critically reflexive eye. As current professionals laboring within and products of historically unjust educational systems, we call upon our literacy and learning support colleagues, regardless of professional organization affiliation, to consider how professional organizations can contribute to decolonizing our profession and our professional practices.

PAUSE, BREATHE, REFLECT...

A Call to Action: Raciolinguistic Perspectives in College Literacy and Learning

For nearly half a century, professional organizations focused on college literacy and learning have called for increased linguistic and cultural diversity in postsecondary literacy instruction and learning support. In 1974, for instance, the postsecondary arm of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), released a resolution on "Students' Right to Their Own Language" (SRTOL). The single-paragraph document "affirm[ed] the students' right to their own patterns and varieties of language—the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style" (CCCC, 1974, p. 1). The statement explicitly connects race and language, noting that "a nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects" (CCCC, 1974, p. 1). The statement was also unique for its time in calling for "experiences and training" for teachers to respect diversity and support students' right to their own language. Geneva Smitherman (2003) describes the statement as a response to "the cultural and linguistic mismatch between higher education and the nontraditional (by virtue of Color and class) students who were making their imprint upon the academic landscape for the first time in history" (p. 19). As such, this early statement connecting race and language foreshadowed similar conversations which would continue in CCCC and which would be taken up within CRLA and the National Organization for Student Success (NOSS) nearly four decades later. However, scholars such as Carmen Kynard (2013) and Smitherman (2003) rightly critique professional organizations' lack of a corresponding pedagogical response to the challenges of affirming raciolinguistic diversity in the college classroom. Since its adoption nearly half a century ago, SRTOL has been thoroughly reviewed, revised, and refined. Despite the ongoing salience of the statement, college literacy and learning professionals continue to teach and engage in literacy practices which deny their students' linguistic and cultural diversity (Williams, 2021d).

Indeed, within the context of college literacy and learning, raciolinguistic justice often remains underexplored within broader conversations about language *or* race (Alim, 2016; Kynard, 2013; Lawton & De Kleine, 2020; Smitherman, 2017). Two recent examples from CRLA and NOSS exemplify how the field of developmental education has retained a broader focus on equity and justice writ large. In her presidential spotlight session, at the 2019 annual CRLA meeting (portions of which she incorporated into her featured essay in the 50th volume of the *Journal of College Reading and Learning*), Armstrong (2020) passionately and persuasively reminds CRLA members,

> Equity is about teaching the culturally and linguistically diverse students who actually sit with us, not the students others assume are there. It's about the opportunity to transition successfully to higher education. It's about learners' rights to theoretically sound and evidence-based curriculum developed by expert

educators. It's about honoring learners' existing languages, literacies, and numeracies, but still ensuring they have access to power discourses in academic contexts. It's about demanding that all have opportunities to engage as active, critical, thoughtful citizens. And at this moment, for me, that is at the top of my list of the most important social justice issues. (p. 64)

Armstrong (2020) concludes with an explanation of the centrality of equity to "the field" of college literacy, and developmental literacy in particular (p. 56).

Emily K. Suh and colleagues (2021) have similarly guided NOSS as an organization to take up an activist stance, connecting developmental education and equity by describing developmental education as "a justice-oriented approach in which educational stakeholders engage at systemic and individual levels to create equitable, inclusive educational environments in which all students have access to and full support from resources, courses, and activities for success" (p. 4). In addition to this broad focus on equity, NOSS released a statement on Racial (In)Justice which affirms the organization's commitment to disrupting systemic racism in education.

Given their emphasis on justice broadly construed, these statements consequently lack an explicit focus on raciolinguistic justice in college literacy and learning contexts. Although advancing an important position to promote equity in higher education, CRLA and NOSS have until now missed a vital opportunity to forefront the importance of raciolinguistic justice. We, the authors, include ourselves in this critique, as leaders within our organizations and contributors to our organizations' position statements and white papers.

Recently however, the CCCC released the DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice. Against the backdrop of anti-Black racist violence at the hands of the state and individuals, the authors declare, "We cannot say that Black Lives Matter if Black Language is not at the forefront of our work as language educators and researchers! …. We want to be clear: This Ain't Another Statement! This is a DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice! PeriodT!" (Baker-Bell et al., 2020, n.p.). Based on their experiences as Black language speakers engaging in activism, teaching, scholarship, and research, the authors demand that:

1. Teachers stop using academic language and standard English as the accepted communicative norm, which reflects White Mainstream English!

2. Teachers stop teaching Black students to code-switch! Instead, we must teach Black students about anti-Black linguistic racism and white linguistic supremacy!

3. Political discussions and praxis center Black Language as teacher-researcher activism for classrooms and communities!

4. Teachers develop and teach Black Linguistic Consciousness that works to decolonize the mind (and/or) language, unlearn white supremacy, and unravel anti-Black linguistic racism!

5. Black dispositions are centered in the research and teaching of Black language! (para. 8)

Each of the above points is supported by an expanded list of demands, many of which specifically related to teaching practice and researching the teaching of English.

Ultimately, the DEMAND calls for Black linguistic justice, which the CCCC statement's authors argue cannot occur without explicitly naming and responding to the role of race and racism in English teaching. The work of Black linguistic justice begins with acknowledging the privileging of certain language forms or varieties over others as both socially constructed and arbitrary. Once we educators understand this, we can recognize how these linguistic ideologies have been used to justify deficit positioning of Black students' use of Black language. Specifically, April Baker-Bell et al. (2020) calls upon teachers to cultivate students' Black Linguistic Consciousness, "the critical literacies and competencies to name, investigate, and dismantle white linguistic hegemony and anti-Black linguistic racism" (p. 86).

Although critical awareness is an essential (and arguably necessary first step) in teaching for raciolinguistic justice, this awareness must also "celebrate and love on Blackness and Black language" (Baker-Bell et al., 2020, n.p.). Importantly (and unlike the SRTOL statement), the CCCC DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice included several examples of how educators and researchers can honor and elevate Black language in the classroom and in scholarship. For instance, the CCCC's Special Committee demands the inclusion of Black voices not just as character dialogue but as authors and voices of authority: This means assigning foundational and current Black authors and language scholars as required readings. This focus on changing instruction and institutional practices exemplified the CCCC statement authors' final demand:

> If you thought these demands were simply about teaching within traditional white norms or fixing Black students and their language practices, you got it wrong! This is a DEMAND for you to do much better in your own self-work that must challenge the multiple institutional structures of anti-Black racism you have used to shape language politics. (para. 8)

Like many of the CCCCs statements preceding it, the DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice called for explicit changes to language practices in professional organizations and in pedagogy, for instance by honoring the lived experience of Black language scholars through citation and peer review processes.

The DEMAND made clear that raciolinguistic justice requires representation in terms of whose voices are included in the curriculum (and how those voices are included); explicit instruction to call out and decolonize language instruction through critical thinking, reading, and writing skills; and promotion of Black English and other historically marginalized English varieties. The literature contains mixed reports on the effective enactment of these recommended practices, suggesting there is yet more work to be done. Ultimately, the authors of the DEMAND! and other notable scholars (Armstrong, 2020; Inoue, 2019b; Kynard, 2013; Smitherman, 2017; Williams 2021a) compel us, as college literacy and learning practitioners, to acknowledge that despite theory, research, and conscience urging otherwise, the disconnect between our good intentions and our curricular, pedagogical, and assessment practices persists.

PAUSE, BREATHE, REFLECT...

Raciolinguistic Praxis: Critical Language Awareness and Antiracist Education

This section introduces the theoretical underpinnings of *raciolinguistic praxis*, a reflexive teaching practice that aims to foster students' awareness of the relationship between race, language, and power. Such a raciolinguistic perspective also provides students with the rhetorical tools to think critically about and respond to racialized language expectations. In this white paper, we theorize raciolinguistic praxis as incorporating both critical language awareness and antiracist education. In this section we first explain these unique perspectives before turning in the following section to specific practices.

CRITICAL LANGUAGE AWARENESS

A raciolinguistic framing allows postsecondary literacy and learning professionals to name and theorize the ways that race and language become intertwined in postsecondary institutions. Critical Language Awareness pedagogy (CLA) is an integral part of an enacted *raciolinguistic praxis*. CLA offers a nuanced and dynamic understanding of language and power for raciolinguistic praxis. Specifically, CLA can help us theorize how language is used and can be taught to critically interrogate *raciolinguistic enregisterment*, or the way language and racial forms are seen as naturally co-occurring signs. CLA can be traced back to a growing interest in postsecondary instruction that supports students' understanding of the relationship between language and power and the impact of race (Clark & Ivanić, 1999).

CLA is a praxis that supports the development of students' critical awareness and linguistic dexterity (Clark et al., 1999; Wallace, 1999). In their review of the literature on CLA studies in developmental English contexts, Deborah Sánchez and Eric Paulson (2008) describe CLA as an understanding of how beliefs become naturalized or assumed to be truths about the natural and social world and how language is used in creating such truths. CLA "encourage[s] students to uncover the ways that the language of texts is socially constructed and how language may position students in negative ways, both purposefully and inadvertently" (Sánchez & Paulson, 2008, p. 166). In this way, CLA shares critical literacy pedagogy's emphasis on teaching rhetorical choices rather than prescriptive notions of correctness and honoring students' strengths as language users (Bauer & Theado, 2014; Greenbaum & Angus, 2018; Young, 2020). CLA also shares ties with critical literacy scholars seeking to disrupt dominant power relations which privilege white mainstream English over other English varieties (Janks, 2013; Lankshear & McLaren, 1993). However, rather than a driving force determining how language is perceived, race is secondary in critical literacy and CLA: Like social class or gender, race simply becomes another line along which asymmetrical relations of power can be created and enforced. In order to centralize the role of race in raciolinguistic praxis, we college literacy and learning professionals must embrace antiracist education.

ANTIRACIST EDUCATION

Although Critical Language Awareness centralizes language and power, antiracist education addresses the interaction of race and power in teaching and learning contexts. Antiracist pedagogy illuminates the ways that race is obscured, and it challenges racist assessment practices in college literacy and learning contexts (Inoue, 2020).

Understanding antiracist education requires first and foremost a shared understanding of the concepts of racism and white supremacy. We use the term *racism* to refer to institutional structures and individual actions that sustain white privilege and racial inequity (Allen, 2017; DiAngelo, 2018; Harper, 2012). Importantly, by this definition, individual intention is irrelevant to identifying an individual's actions as racist. Such a definition also highlights the role of institutions and policies in perpetuating racism (see the Appendix for a glossary of relevant terms).

Racism is inextricably linked to white supremacy. DiAngelo (2018) defines white supremacy as

> The all-encompassing centrality and assumed superiority of people defined and perceived as white and the practices based on this assumption. White supremacy in this context does not refer to individual white people and their individual intentions or actions but to an overarching political, economic, and social system of domination. (p. 28)

In popular culture, the phrase white supremacy is often reserved for extremist groups, such as the Ku Klux Klan. However, such reductive associations of white supremacy with radical individuals or groups obscure the systemic nature of white supremacy; it is these very "taken-for-granted aspects that underwrite all other political and social contracts" that maintain white supremacy's power (DiAngelo, 2018, p. 29). Recognizing white supremacy as a system of benefit and the practices that maintain this system for white people allows us as postsecondary literacy and learning professionals to examine our educational practices—and the systems or origins which maintain these practices—without challenging the goodness or morality of individual teachers.

Antiracist pedagogy interrupts the co-naturalization of race and language and examines how this co-naturalization positions racially minoritized students' language as deficient (e.g., negative perceptions about the purity or correctness of Latine students' Spanish and English use). Antiracist pedagogy "explicitly interrogate[s] *the daily operation of* white supremacy *in our field and on our campuses*" (Kynard, 2015, p. 14, emphasis in original). This work requires that we recognize the systemic nature of racism, learn the histories and realities of racially minoritized students and faculty, and recognize the diversity which is lost in overly generic discussions of people of color writ large (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Inoue, 2015; Kishimoto, 2018; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lu, 1994; Yosso et al., 2004). Such an understanding of the relationship between race and power complements CLA theorizations of language and power.

ENACTING RACIOLINGUISTICALLY JUST PRAXIS

In this section, we present a series of pedagogies that embody both critical language awareness and antiracist education. Taken together, these pedagogies form a praxis for enacting raciolinguistic justice. For each of these pedagogies, we explain the theoretical background and connections to antiracist, raciolinguistic praxis. We then offer specific examples of the applications to college learning and literacy instruction. The following section then includes a range of examples from the literature to contextualize the described pedagogies and to illustrate their enactment as part of larger reflexive efforts, at the individual and institutional levels, that undergird the important work of systems change.

DISRUPTING THE MYTH OF LINGUISTIC HOMOGENEITY

By teaching students to develop their linguistic dexterity and explicitly challenge racist language practices in placement, instruction, and assessment, critical language awareness challenges what Paul Kai Matsuda (2006) refers to as the *myth of linguistic homogeneity*. This myth involves "the tacit and widespread acceptance of the dominant image of composition students as native speakers of a privileged variety of English" (p. 639). These imaginary students share two important characteristics: First, they are native (a term which itself Matsuda explains problematically glosses over issues of domestic and international language variety)—and monolingual—English speakers. Second, such students are presumed to speak a privileged (i.e., standardized) variety of English. According to Matsuda, such generalizations about students are so commonly accepted that they are rarely acknowledged let alone challenged.

Not only does the myth of linguistic homogeneity perpetuate an inaccurate understanding of college students, such generalizations prevent all postsecondarry educators from recognizing student difference and ultimately alienate students who do not fit this mythical profile. As Looker (2016) aptly argues, this myth of a single type of student language user results in overlooking linguistic diversity due to socioeconomic class, geographic region, age, and other identity markers of students typically perceived as mainstream and in writing perceived as standard or academic. Looker urges English faculty to broaden their understandings of linguistic diversity in order to prevent further "equating of 'non-academic' with 'non-white'" and to challenge the tacit acceptance of historically white upper-class language practices (p. 179). In other words, disrupting the myth of linguistic homogeneity recognizes the existence and acceptability

of multiple language varieties; it also names the role of race in language difference and, most importantly, in race-motivated perceptions of language difference.

Nearly a decade ago, Writing Program Administrator and practitioner-scholar Staci Perryman-Clark (2012) described the lack of pedagogical practices that align with composition's growing interest in the relationship between cultural and linguistic diversity. Despite the continued need for additional progress, the literature contains a growing list of wise practices that emphasize students' right to their own language and further develop their ability to write and think critically about their writing (Carter, 2009; Dew, 2003; Downs & Wardle, 2007). Several college writing and literacy faculty discuss expanding the English varieties their students are exposed to and are invited to use in class (Gallagher, 2020; Lee & Handsfield, 2018; Miller-Cochran, 2012; Perryman-Clark, 2012; Shelton & Howson, 2014). For example, in her first-year composition courses, Kynard (2007) demonstrated the value of Black English through what she referred to as "vernacular teaching" to create "a space where critical literacy and vernacular traditions can meet and shape students' sense of themselves as writers, thinkers, and social agents" (p. 332). Similar to the iconic way she codemeshes in her professional writing, in her class, Kynard used language that was authentic and culturally sustainable (Paris & Alim, 2015)—it fostered "linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as a part of the democratic project of schooling" (Paris, 2012, p. 93). Kynard's very use of Black English interrupted expectations of standardized, white middle class English as the preferred variety for communication in her classroom.

Kynard also disrupted the normalization of white English through her assigned readings. In particular, she intentionally assigned a variety of readings related to Pan-African political movements and invited students into a contemporary co-construction of Pan-Africanism (i.e., honoring their voices and experiences as individuals of African descent to make sense of and work towards social and political emancipation for peoples across the African Diaspora). In particular, Kynard described how the learning management system's discussion board had become a popular and effective space for students to confront issues of linguistic appropriateness and technological access. By inviting students to engage with a variety of Englishes for multiple academic purposes, Kynard demonstrated the effectiveness of non-standardized varieties of English and created virtual and physical classroom spaces for what Suresh Canagarajah (1997) refers to as the "empowerment of minority students and the pluralization of dominant discourses" (p. 195, cited by Kynard p. 342–343). In this way, Kynard's intentional text selection and the literacy practices in which Kynard's students engaged as they interacted with

these texts are supported by recommendations from the CCCC demand for linguistic justice.

In a first-year writing course structured around the theme of language diversity, Looker (2016) introduced a diverse array of language varieties. Writing about writing as it relates to student language requires a recognition of the diversity inherent in the language practices of all writers, for example, by focusing on an author's rhetorical choices given their available linguistic repertoire. As Looker (2016) explains,

> If I believe that linguistic diversity—a meshing of dialects, registers, and intertextual influences—is the norm for all writers and speakers, then I must show that belief to my students, along with its corollary belief that standard language ideologies, dictating certain forms as superior to others, affect us all. (p. 186)

Throughout the semester, Looker combined a range of texts of varying modalities to address the three concepts she identifies as most important to understanding the centrality of language variation in writing: (1) language varies and changes, (2) language affects individuals' perceptions, (3) academic language is a type of language like any other. Through these units, Looker guided students through an exploration of their own language features and an introduction to language standards and ideologies in order to challenge their assumptions about standardization.

PROMOTING RACIAL LITERACY

Racial literacy refers to individuals' understanding of the complex and powerful ways that race impacts individuals and groups in terms of their educational, social, economic, and political experiences (Bernstein, 2018; Guinier, 2004; Sealey-Ruiz, 2013, 2021; Skerrett, 2011). Racial literacy is predicated upon an explicit awareness of racism as a structural phenomenon and the ways that racism and disadvantage are mutually reinforced at the institutional level; indeed, Lani Guinier (2004) explains racial literacy as "the capacity to decipher the durable racial grammar that structures racialized hierarchies and frames the narratives of nations" (p. 100). This *systems thinking* is an important component of racial literacy's awareness of institutional and environmental constraints on individual agency and actions (Skerrett, 2011).

Other practitioner-scholars highlight the systems-level perspective necessary for racial literacy. Grayson (2017), for instance, calls for teaching students to "interrogate the rhetorical practices that maintain the long-standing hegemonic infrastructure of American life" (p. 145). In discussing racial literacy, Yolanda Sealey-Ruiz (2013) emphasizes that it is "a skill and practice in which individuals

are able to probe the existence of racism and examine the effects of race and institutionalized systems on their experiences and representation in US society" (p. 386). A growing number of practitioner-scholars explore race talk as a rhetorical construct or the discourses of students and teachers' racial literacy development (Clary-Lemon, 2009; Dutro et al., 2008; Rogers & Mosley, 2008; Skerrett, 2011; Vetter & Hungerford-Kresser, 2014). This work also has examined issues of intersectionality. For example, Pruitt (2015) describes the potential literacy practices of reading about "the Other" to identify intersections of race, queer identity, and allyship for marginalized students (p. 359). A growing body of literacy instruction incorporates the use of literature, written reflection, and critical thinking skills to explore issues of race and racism (see, for example, Boston & Baxley, 2007; Brooks et al., 2008; Carson et al., 2021; Grayson, 2017; Grue, 2020; Love, 2014; Williams, 2009, 2012a, 2012b, 2013).

However, as Grayson (2017) aptly notes, the growing interest in students' development of language practices for the purpose of discussing race and racism has been accompanied by "little definition or explication of the particular skills that make up these [racial literacy] practices" (p. 145). To Grayson, critical reading and response are foundational skills for racial literacy. Sealey-Ruiz (2013) similarly described postsecondary racial literacy as encompassing "the ability to read, discuss, and write about situations that involve race or racism" (p. 386). Additional research is needed to explore how we as college literacy and learning professionals can further develop students' literacy skills in order to facilitate their racial literacy. Below we summarize some of the existing literature on a few such literacy instructional practices.

Grayson (2017) argues, "There is no venue better fitted to racial literacy than first-year composition" (p. 161). Grayson (2017) had students use narrative song lyrics as racial literacy texts to generate their written products. Students read and listened to the lyrics through rhetorical and critical lenses examining the author, intended audience, representation and erasure within the text, and the contexts in which the text was produced and received. Students then wrote commentaries, responses, personal reflections, character analyses, and a research paper exploring representation within real-life situations.

Others have also documented the power of a racial literacy-focused classroom for creating space for dialogue. In Sealey-Ruiz's (2013) first-year composition class, for instance, the author used the documentary "A Class Divided" and Debra Dickerson's autobiography, An American Story, to create cognitive dissonance and interrogate with students issues of race and racism. Sealey-

Ruiz described how students' freewriting developed into their essays about questions raised by the documentary. The author further noted students' "insist[ence] on talking about the film as a class" as an unintended benefit of the unit (p. 391). Students in a developmental writing class at a tribal college engaged by "discussing, historicizing, and validating Navajo English," aligning with their tribal college's mission of advancing student learning through "the study of Diné language[s], history, and culture" (Toth, 2013, p. 22). In particular, students examined the role of settler colonialism in shaping world Englishes and developed their metalinguistic awareness by viewing editing as an act of rhetorical choices based on purpose and audience. Throughout the class, students' writing assignments were informed by their reading and discussion of historical and living legal documents related to the ongoing fights for Diné sovereignty and continued Diné cultural and linguistic development. This explicit attention to metalinguistic awareness within discussion and written assignments adds an important component for enacting a raciolinguistic praxis.

In these descriptions by practitioner-scholars, students of all races develop their racial literacy and ability to engage in thoughtful discussions about race and systemic racism through the content of carefully selected texts. These examples of racial literacy practice all facilitated productive race talk in which students connected concepts of race and racism from the text to their lived experiences and the world around them and applied their critical thinking and reflective skills to analyze racial inequity. As Grayson (2017) explains, "Interrogating racialized language is itself a step toward racial literacy" (p. 160). Importantly, the students were able to engage with these texts because of the intentional environment these practitioner-scholars created.

Additionally, racial literacy theory and practice must also incorporate an explicit awareness of literacy as a racialized practice: In college literacy and learning contexts, racial literacy must address the ways that race and language are intertwined so that students critically examine not only artifacts of race from popular culture but also from the academy itself and the language expectations within that space. In the literature on racial literacy described above, language was frequently reduced to a means for instructional focus on race or was analyzed as the medium through which racial literacy was demonstrated. As a result, we as college literacy and learning instructors may inadvertently be encouraging students to write and talk about race (often by drawing from personal experiences) without acknowledging how we continue to evaluate *what* students say about race and *how* they use language to say it based upon our assumptions about students' willingness

and ability to use standardized language. Such a focus on race as content without a simultaneous examination of the role of race in language expectations fails to acknowledge how the language practices of racially minoritized students can be viewed as deficient by virtue of the students' race rather than their level of adherence to standardized English norms (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Stanley, 2017).

Flores and Rosa (2015) describe how rules of academic appropriateness encourage "language-minoritized students to model their linguistic practices after the white speaking subject despite the fact that the white listening subject continues to perceive their language use in racialized ways" (p. 149). In other words, we literacy and learning professionals have been guilty of asking students to reflect upon race but have failed to similarly acknowledge how race influences the ways that we perceive and assess their written reflections. As Inoue (2020) explains,

> In a world made racist already, our biases and initial ideas about things will tend to be racist. That's because structures and systems, like academic disciplines and schools, by default reproduce White supremacy in their DNA. This is even more true for particular habits in language, ones that will seem like just good writing and so apolitical to many students. But they all come from our racist histories of English and the teaching of it. Investigating them will be key to understanding what they do in our reading practices. (p. 150)

Racial literacy must therefore develop not just students' ability to talk about race but also our ability as instructors to engage in culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris & Alim, 2015) that honors and extends students' home and community language practices while simultaneously interrupting racist instructional and assessment practices.

FACILITATING ANTIRACIST READING

Like Bettina Love (2019), Ibram Kendi (2019), and other antiracist educators, Inoue (2020) argues that there is no neutral position when it comes to racism: "Not doing racism is allowing it to continue, and in many cases, it's actually doing racist stuff" (p. 135). This adage is as true in reading as it is in other practices. Indeed, Inoue describes the act of reading as "an inquiry into the reader's own language habits and the larger dominant structural forces and influences outside the reader, ones usually a product of White supremacy and White racial domination" (p. 134). Critical, mindful reading requires that readers ask several questions about how they come to understand a text as they read. This process of understanding is informed by

recognizing the social structures that shape readers' habits for sense-making.

A reader must be aware of their habits of language and judgment (or the ways that they use and think about language) and from whence these habits emerge. Drawing from Bourdieu's notion of the *habitus*, Inoue (2020) explains,

> Our language habits are formed because we are what we do in the places we are at with the people around us. Racial, economic, and gendered segregation and separation in various places in our society make our languaging racialized, economically determined, and gendered. (p. 136)

Learned through our interactions with other people, our reading habits are also habits of judging language: assessing the author's claims and rhetorical effectiveness. These habits are structured by how we as people have been socialized, and because of this socialization through white supremacy, our habits of and judgments about language use similarly reinforce racism if we do not actively identify, understand, and adjust these habits and judgments.

Simply put, antiracist reading examines both an individual's language habits and the larger structures that shape those habits. It allows the reader to question whether the impact of their language or judgment is a racially unjust or unfair distribution of resources. Inoue asks, "Does it produce a racialized hierarchy in some way? If so, then it is White supremacist" (p. 151; see also Kendi, 2019). Such recognition does not dwell upon the goodness or morality of individuals; further, it is necessary in order for us to take responsibility for our world and the role we play in shaping it.

Inoue's (2020) antiracist reading framework that was described in this white paper's call to reflexivity is a model antiracist reading practice. Inoue introduces antiracist reading by explaining his premise that white language habits of judgment (in other words, the ways that teachers and all readers evaluate language use) were created from and are sustained by racist systems. The resulting language habits are not automatically and unequivocally racialized or in support of white language supremacy; however, our ideas and biases often tend to be racist because they exist in a world which is already racist. For example, readers may prefer the PIE (Point, Illustration, Explanation) structure as an organizational device and thereby negatively assess alternative organizational patterns without recognizing from whence this pattern originated or how their preference for such a structure might dissuade them from reading authors

who utilize other organizational structures. Readers can consult Inoue's (2020) explanation of antiracist reading to engage more deeply with the literature and theories upon which he bases his argument about how white language has come to be seen as naturalized, neutral, and objective while obscuring how the language produces a racial hierarchy or unfair distribution of resources and prestige.

Inoue (2020) presents multiple specific versions of the antiracist reading steps that can be used to increase readers' mindfulness related to their literacy habits. Increased mindfulness allows individuals to recognize how and when they make quick judgments about what they are reading based on their previous exposure to the topic or their emotional investment in their beliefs about it. Inoue's framework provides a tool for our own reading—as both literacy and learning professionals who are tasked with teaching, supporting, and assessing student writing and as individuals who are on a personal journey towards raciolinguistic justice. If we college literacy and learning professionals want to be more just in our practicing, teaching, supporting, and assessing of literacy, we must commit ourselves to the mindful and reflexive practice of antiracist reading. This begins with acknowledging what Inoue (2020) refers to as the six habits of white language and judgment: "(1) an unseen, naturalized, universal orientation to the world, (2) hyperindividualism, (3) a stance of false neutrality, objectivity, and apoliticality, (4) the individualized, rational, controlled self, (5) rule-governed, contractual relationships, and (6) clarity, order, and control" (pp. 19–20). Within these habits is the unwavering acknowledgement that white language was created within and maintains systems which are already racist (for more on these habits, see Inoue [2020]).

Teaching ourselves and our students to recognize the six habits is a necessary precondition for engaging in the antiracist reading practices of understanding why we are emotionally attached to the ideas we form in response to our reading and identifying where these ideas and biases originated in our lives. Importantly, however, this recognition is in preparation for–it is not the entirety of–an antiracist practice. As Inoue (2020) explains, once readers acknowledge the ways that white language is normalized and the role these habits and judgments have had in their own language use and beliefs, they can begin seeking "ways forward and out, to change, to be anti-" (p. 135).

ENCOURAGING CODEMESHING

One current opportunity for promoting raciolinguistic justice relates to the way that we as college literacy and learning professionals conceptualize and teach about language varieties and how to combine them to achieve varying rhetorical purposes. Vershawn Ashanti Young (2009) describes codemeshing as "the blending and concurrent use of American English dialects in formal, discursive products, such as political speeches, student papers, and media interviews" (p. 51). This definition shares similarities with *codeswitching*, or what linguists had previously defined as the concurrent use of multiple languages or language varieties (Auer, 1988; Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010; Tay, 1989). However, several scholars and practitioners, including Young, critique the way that codeswitching has been taught as translating English varieties into standardized English and allowing these varieties in non-academic settings rather than the blending of languages or language varieties (Canagarajah, 2006, 2011; Inoue, 2015: Young & Barrett, 2018; Young & Martinez, 2011). In this way, English varieties remain positioned as less-than while standardized English continues to be taught as the language of respectability and advancement. As Gallagher (2020) concludes, "If we lived in a non-racist society, maybe (maybe) having students clean up their writing would give them access to power, but we don't live in that society" (p. 24). Given, however, that students learn and live in highly racialized (and racist) systems, codeswitching as previously noted, results in practices which appear to respect all students' right to their own language while actually privileging the white language standard that students are expected to translate their language into. Advising codeswitching is immoral in its positioning of standardized English as the language of respectability and advancement, it is also ineffective at allowing non-white students to gain respectability and advancement given the racist systems in which these students are judged.

As the authors of the CCCC *DEMAND for Linguistic Justice* argue, "Code-switching, and contrastive analysis [are taught] *at the expense of Black students*. This is linguistically violent to the humanity and spirit of Black Language speakers" (para. 11). Indeed, codeswitching implies that certain Englishes are inferior because college literacy and learning professionals teach students that those language varieties must be switched out for the superior "standard"—a concept which is itself highly problematic (CCCC, 2020, para. 6). Young (2009) describes codeswitching instruction as nothing short of "translat[ing] the racist logic of early twentieth-century legal segregation into a linguistic logic that undergirds twenty-first century language instruction" (p. 55). Rather than teaching students to switch out of one English variety for another, codemeshing presents all languages and language varieties as having inherent value. According to Canagarajah (2006), codemeshing can be utilized in translanguaging pedagogies to create race-conscious classroom spaces by focusing on "rhetorically strategic" ways (p. 599)

to "accommodate more than one code within the boundaries of the same text" (p. 598) while simultaneously promoting student and teacher race-consciousness. This race-consciousness exists at the heart of codemeshers' tolerance of and humility for negotiating differences with their interlocutors. Codemeshing pedagogy honors and strengthens students' ability to apply their racial, linguistic, and attitudinal resources to achieve their rhetorical goals.

Codemeshing is a challenging skill to master. Gallagher (2020), who invites students to codemesh in written essays, summarizes,

> This kind of writing encourages students to do things we want students to do in all their writing: It pushes them toward a craft-wise attitude toward writing as they make sentence by sentence decisions about audience and purpose. And it does so in a way that makes possible a political take on language. (p. 21)

In reflecting on her own experience of codemeshing in her book, *Talkin* and *Testifyin*, Smitherman states, "This kind of writing was the hardest writing I have ever done… representing Black linguistic authenticity and simultaneously making it intelligible for those lacking linguistic competence in Ebonics" (p. 9, as cited in Gallagher, 2020, p. 21).

Despite these challenges, assignments which encourage codemeshing can offer students "a chance to tackle the politics of proper English head-on. It allows, but does not force, them to take an anti-assimilationist stance" (Gallagher, 2020, p. 25). So how can we as postsecondary literacy educators and learning center professionals teach and support students' use of codemeshing? What does codemeshing look like in practice? Gallagher describes an assignment from his community college English 101 class that asked students to take the viewpoint of a stakeholder in a provided scenario and answer the question "Should other varieties of English, or other languages, be allowed/acceptable in professional settings, schools, work places, etc.?" (p. 19). The assignment required that students make and defend a claim using evidence from assigned readings, respond to counterarguments, and take risks. Gallagher also invited students to "be adventurous in terms of language [and] code switch/mesh" (p. 20), concepts they had been introduced to by reading Young, hooks, and others. Ultimately, as Gallagher concludes, codemeshing helps students develop as conscious, critical writers who are able to assert their rhetorical sovereignty (Lyons, 2000), including their right to use a variety of Englishes and to mesh them.

EMPLOYING ANTIRACIST WRITING ASSESSMENT

Antiracist education requires renewed attention to curricular outcomes. As literacy and learning professionals, our reliance upon idiosyncratic versions of a white disciplinary discourse as the standard for judging students and for teaching students to master the standardized language naturalize and justify the standard. In an institutional analysis of documents related to writing outcomes, Jamila Kareem (2019) explained how writing-focused student learning outcomes reflect what Elaine Richardson (2003) refers to as "White supremacist literacy" notions of appropriateness (p. 9). Kareem argues, "Race is an absent presence, as the academic conventions required in different writing situations are based in conventions shaped by middle-class white American perspectives disguised as innate" (p. 279). For example, the requirement that students "'demonstrate control of surface features such as grammar, punctuation, and spelling' (Department of English)" can penalize students' correct application of Latine-centric structural conventions when they are assessed by American writing professors from the dominant raciolinguistic culture who lack familiarity with high-context writing cultures (Kareem, 2019, p. 279). Kareem offers an alternative antiracist outcome that asks students to "[give] attention to the influence of style and usage on composing effective communication," explaining how such an outcome highlights students' knowledge and experiences with varied literacy and rhetorical traditions. As Inoue (2015) explained, the proposed shift in the assessment refocuses on students' attention to their stylistic choices rather than their mastery of a particular (standardized) form. Importantly, however, changing the objectives is only part of this work; it must also be accompanied by the individual reflection that we, the authors, advocate in this white paper.

Drawing from a range of assessment scholars including Faigley (1992), Hanson (1993) and others, Inoue (2015) describes how large-scale assessments, including the ACT, SAT, and AP exams privilege middle class preferences and white racial perspectives and values, all of which are used to justify the intelligence and linguistic superiority of test-takers who model these perspectives. Furthermore, these standardized assessments "wash back" into the classroom via class-specific assessments and instruction in a cyclical fashion (Weigle, 2002, p. 54). Because (predominantly) white teachers judge students' language practices according to dominant (e.g., white) discourse conventions, race is present in this cycle. Inoue concluded, "Power is hidden more effectively because a set of white racial dispositions are already hidden in the assessment in various places, assumed as the standard" (p. 26). In other

words, assessments that favor white, middle class ways of using and judging language become the justification for the continued upholding of these language forms. As a result, raciolinguistically minoritized students who are also new to college face multiple challenges in uncovering and negotiating these discourse expectations even when they are encouraged by faculty to incorporate personal experiences of race, language, ethnicity, or class as a part of graded writing assignments (Buell, 2012; Rankins-Robertson et al., 2010; Suh et al., in press).

In response to the inherent shortcomings of traditional assessments, Inoue (2015) advocates for an antiracist classroom writing assessment ecology which addresses the complexity of classroom assessment, the interconnectedness of people and things, and the inescapably political nature of all uneven social relations. A sustainable, just classroom assessment ecology is one which critically examines the structures and beliefs undergirding the reading and judging of each member of the classroom community. This means that community members are constantly engaged in dialogue about the ways language holds meaning and value—as well as how it comes to be valued and how community members affect its meaning and value making.

Inoue centers such a justice-oriented ecology around labor, or the work that students put into their writing. The ecology's negotiated meaning and value making support raciolinguistic justice because they acknowledge the unequal access to power within the classroom and challenge the presumed inherent superiority of white standardized language. However, adoption of labor-based grading is not an outright rejection of standardized English. As Inoue (2015) explains,

> The larger goal of any antiracist writing assessment ecology is to encourage students to problematize their existential writing assessment situations. To problematize means students must pose questions about their colleagues' and their own drafts, then investigate those questions, which essentially are ones about the nature of judgment and language, leading students to understanding their own *habitus* and the white racial *habitus* of the academy. (p. 84)

Such labor-based grading encourages conversation and reflection on how students can move their writing to match local dominant dispositions, but these practices do not tie students' grades to how closely their writing adheres to those dispositions. In so doing, labor-based grading as a part of an antiracist assessment ecology promotes raciolinguistic justice by acknowledging the ways that language encodes race and honoring the language choices that students make. Inoue (2015) concludes, "Healthy writing assessment ecologies have at their core dialogue about what students and teachers know, how students and teachers judge language differently, so that students are also agents in the ecology, not simply objects to be measured" (p. 84). Importantly, this approach is not an outright rejection of standardized language but rather instruction that introduces standardized language as another approach available to students among their many communicative choices.

Inoue (2005) also describes labor-based grading as a form of community-based assessment. Over the course of three semesters in a land grant university writing classroom, Inoue (2005) developed and refined a practice of community-based assessment in which students led the class rubric design by analyzing self-selected examples of "'good writing' that best fit the kind of writing" students understand the assignment to be eliciting (p. 215). During this process, Inoue encouraged students to question their rubric criteria, and, in particular, to question their assumptions about notions of correctness before coming to a general consensus. Throughout the term, Inoue (2015) directed students back up to their questions about and refinement of the rubric: "The important thing is that they do the constructing and revising, so that they have ownership of the language and contents of whatever rubric we end up with" (p. 216). Importantly, the rubric Inoue's students developed allowed them to assess themselves and their peers without the assessment being attached to a point value or grade.

Inoue (2019a) characterizes the "dimension-based rubrics" his students designed as a tool which "articulate[s] the dimensions of writing that students wish to explore and develop in a given writing assignment" (p. 392). In contrast to a standards-based rubric focused on evidence and supporting details, Inoue offers the following example of a dimension-based rubric prompt: "What evidence and reasoning do you see or hear? What evidence and reasoning do you not see or hear in the draft? Where do your ideas of evidence come from?" (p. 392). Rather than judging a student's writing as meeting or failing to meet the prescribed standard, such a rubric prompt opens up a dialogue between the student reader and student author while still encouraging the author to consider how they might make revisions to better convey their meaning and purpose to their audience. Through their use of their co-constructed rubrics and their resulting revision work, students learn to advocate for themselves, identify their areas of growth, and seek assistance. Ultimately, Inoue (2005, 2019a) and others who describe similar approaches

to self-assessment or labor-based grading (Inman & Powell, 2018; West-Puckett, 2016) persuasively argue that assessment is pedagogy, and students learn the most through doing rather than receiving assessment.

As Inoue (2005, 2019a) noted, applications of antiracist assessment have the potential to extend beyond a single written assignment or even course. For example, Toth's (2018) description of directed self-placement suggests its potential as a related form of antiracist assessment. Although directed self-placement does not involve reiterative conversations between reader and author, directed self-placement honors students' agency in self-assessment, specifically related to their assessment of their preparation for college-level courses. Toth rightly cautions that those seeking to establish directed self-placement as an equity measure must first have a firm sense of their demographic data and how self-placement is enacted by students who are members of minoritized groups. Toth's and others' (Burns et al., 2018; West-Puckett, 2016) work can further inspire future practitioner-scholars' exploration of the potential for embracing antiracist assessment practices beyond the college English classroom.

PAUSE, BREATHE, REFLECT...

Williams' Framework for Raciolinguistically Just Literacy Instruction

This section presents a newly developed framework from our co-author, Jeanine L. Williams (2021d; *originally published by Williams Higher Education Consulting, LLC and reprinted here with permission*). Rather than presenting sections of the framework, we have intentionally chosen to reprint the framework in its entirety in order to illustrate how a raciolinguistic praxis is multi-faceted and interconnecting. Just as equity and inclusion work are a journey, Williams' *Framework for Raciolinguistically Just Literacy Instruction* demonstrates how this ongoing and reflexive work extends beyond instruction to assessment and even ways students dialogue with themselves and their writing in the classroom. Simply put, this work must be understood holistically.

This framework draws on Williams' previous work on identity, cultural and linguistic diversity, culturally responsive teaching, critical literacy, and social justice and is the product of her own critical, reflexive practice as a practitioner-scholar-activist within postsecondary literacy (Carson et al., 2021; Williams, 2009, 2010, 2012a, 2012b, 2013, 2021a, 2021b, 2021c, 2021d). In addition, parts of

this framework were developed through a collaborative effort to implement labor-based grading with writing program colleagues at the author's institution. Through this collaboration, the author developed and refined ideas related to the reframing of grammar instruction, the relationship between grades and instructor feedback, and the specific reflection questions for students to answer.

This framework is the result of the author's acknowledgment of the ideas and pedagogies covered in the previous sections of this white paper as well as her recognition of the need for a cohesive and actionable plan for enacting raciolinguistic justice in the postsecondary literacy classroom. The framework weaves together linguistic heterogeneity, racial literacy, antiracist reading, and codemeshing. Specifically, Williams' framework addressed two key questions: (1) What does a cohesive raciolinguistically just postsecondary literacy praxis look like? and (2) How might we redesign instruction to prepare students for the current state of postsecondary literacy, while also working toward more equitable and just literacy ideologies and practices?

Raciolinguistically just postsecondary literacy instruction acknowledges and respects the humanity and birthright of all participants and allows them both ownership over and agency within their literacy practices. Such literacy instruction realizes that in addition to the goals and objectives set by the instructor for any given assignment, each student has their own goals and objectives for their work. Students' goals and objectives are reflective of their linguistic, cultural, social, political, and historical contexts. These goals and objectives add meaning and richness to the students' work, and they influence the way a student approaches an assignment—including the ways in which the student chooses to use language to convey meaning. Postsecondary literacy instruction that is raciolinguistically just not only acknowledges the students' right to own and exercise agency over their literacy practices, it is designed to facilitate students' ownership and agency. Raciolinguistically just literacy instruction is a joint venture between professionals and students wherein they are both teachers and learners of language and literacy. In this joint venture, faculty and students work together towards three goals: (1) to build their critical language awareness, (2) to hone their capacity for exercising linguistic dexterity, and (3) to justly assess students' work (Williams, 2021d).

GOAL #1: BUILDING CRITICAL LANGUAGE AWARENESS

To build the critical language awareness necessary to successfully navigate diverse linguistic spaces, faculty and students should engage in a series of readings that explore

the complex interplay between language, literacy, and culture, and the power and politics of language and literacy. Next, faculty and students should explore the concept of linguistic dexterity by examining a variety of linguistic/rhetorical traditions such as Black/African Diasporic, Latine, Chicano/a, Indigenous, and Appalachian. The specific traditions studied should also be reflective of the linguistic backgrounds of the students and faculty in the classroom. Similar to Looker's (2016) approach, students and faculty should consider and share the characteristics of their own linguistic traditions. Guided through a comparative analysis, students and faculty should explore the cultural, historical, social, and political dimensions of these various linguistic/rhetorical traditions. It is important that "academic English" is included in this exploration as yet another linguistic tradition that reflects particular cultural, historical, social, and political assumptions.

In raciolinguistically just literacy instruction—building critical language awareness and honing linguistic dexterity—it is imperative to redefine the ways in which grammar is taught and practiced. Even within conversations about language diversity, grammar is often presented as a fixed set of rules that are universal and common across linguistic traditions. What is considered and taught as grammar is based solely on white language habits and "standard English," when in reality, one of the distinguishing features of diverse linguistic traditions is their use of punctuation, word choice, and how sentences are structured to construct and convey ideas. Moreover, even while all linguistic traditions have their own rules for grammar, these rules are often purposefully "broken" by individuals who want to use language in ways that are more creative and more aligned with their communicative aims. Raciolinguistically just literacy instruction views grammar not as a set of fixed rules, but as intentional choices made by language users to convey both style and meaning. In other words, students have both ownership and agency in their language choices—including choosing to codemesh (Williams, 2021d).

GOAL #2: HONING LINGUISTIC DEXTERITY

With a solid foundation of critical language awareness, faculty and students can more fully exercise their *linguistic dexterity*. Linguistic dexterity is the ability to leverage critical language awareness to assess and skillfully navigate diverse linguistic spaces. It focuses on intentionality and authenticity in the communicative or linguistic approach. Moreover, it supports the freedom to utilize the entirety of individuals' linguistic milieus and repertoires—the awareness of and ability to withstand white language supremacy. To facilitate students' linguistic dexterity, and ultimately their ability to effectively and confidently

codemesh, Williams (2021d) argues for redesigning postsecondary literacy instruction to support these aims. This includes presenting students with different writing/communicative contexts, a reflective/metacognitive element where students examine their various linguistic avenues and make intentional linguistic/rhetorical choices to most effectively achieve their goals for writing, and critical consideration of the "pitfalls" of particular linguistic/rhetorical choices and how they might be mitigated while still remaining true to the writer's purpose. The ultimate goal is to understand how to circumvent or counter white language supremacist responses to diverse linguistic/rhetorical approaches, as opposed to simply reverting back to "standard edited English" as the only acceptable or effective approach to writing in academic spaces.

To this end, Williams advances a **five-step reflective process** for students to engage with and demonstrate their linguistic dexterity.

Step 1: Students Define Their Audience
In this step, students answer questions including:

- *Who is my audience?*

- *What is the specific rhetorical context?*

- *How does my audience identify linguistically and culturally?*

- *Given who my audience is linguistically and culturally, and the rhetorical context, what are the expectations for communication?*

Step 2: Students Define Who They Are In Respect To Audience and Rhetorical Context
In this step, students answer questions such as:

- *What is my relationship to the audience?*

- *What is my position in this specific rhetorical context?*

- *How do I identify linguistically and culturally?*

- *Given who I am linguistically and culturally, and the rhetorical context, what are my goals and expectations for communication?*

Step 3: Students Consider Their Linguistic and Rhetorical Options
The third step is for students to consider their linguistic and rhetorical options for presenting their ideas, given their audience, the rhetorical context, and how they identify linguistically and culturally. In particular, students draw upon their linguistic backgrounds to identify their communicative options, along with the pros and cons of each option. This

step is also a space for students to apply their knowledge of race and cultural context to the decisions they make about their language use.

In this step, students answer questions such as:

- *What are my options for communicating with my intended audience?*

- *How does each option impact my ability to reach my audience?*

- *What are the pros and cons of each option in terms of my ability to reach my audience?*

Step 4: Students Select and Assert Their Linguistic/Rhetorical Approach

In the fourth step, students select and celebrate their sense of ownership and intentionality related to their language use. In this step, students pay attention to questions like

- *What linguistic and rhetorical approach do I feel is most appropriate and why?*

- *What are the potential drawbacks given my audience, the rhetorical context, and how I identify linguistically and culturally?*

- *How will I mitigate the drawbacks so that my message is well received?*

Step 5: Students Determine the Most Appropriate Support and Sources For Their Writing

The final step involves answering questions such as:

- *What types of support/sources would most appeal to my audience and why?*

- *What types of support/sources are most aligned with my linguistic/rhetorical approach?*

- *How might I incorporate support/sources that stretch my audience?*

- *How might I make them accessible to my audience?*

By engaging in this process, students can leverage the entirety of their linguistic repertoires to make intentional, nuanced, and complex language choices, without simply submitting to white language supremacy. Encouraging students' use and development of their linguistic dexterity must necessarily be accompanied by assessment practices that honor students' intentional language choices rather than continuing to hold them to white supremacist standards (Williams, 2021d).

GOAL #3: JUSTLY ASSESSING STUDENT WRITING

Assessment within raciolinguistically just literacy instruction, again, reflects the humanity and birthright of all participants and respects and facilitates students' ownership over and agency within their literacy practices, which includes student-determined goals and objectives. Thus, assessment takes equally into account how well the student meets the goals and objectives set by the instructor and goals and objectives set by the students themselves. Furthermore, students are free to use language in ways that best align with their goals, objectives, and chosen linguistic approach. Thus, assessing grammar becomes focused on whether the students' language choices demonstrate a consistent, purposeful, and goal-aligned writing style, along with whether the students' language choices facilitate readability and understanding of their ideas. To accomplish this, raciolinguistically just assessment is about transparency, community, and conversation—not about gatekeeping and upholding white supremacist language standards (Williams, 2021d).

Shifting away from traditional writing assessment that is linguistically inequitable and unjust, assessment should be focused on the students' linguistic awareness and dexterity as opposed to what white language habits deem "right or correct." Assessing writing within this framework centers the linguistic and rhetorical thinking in which the students engage and considers how well the students consider the possible linguistic and rhetorical approaches to the writing/communicative context, how well the students justify their linguistic/rhetorical choices, how well the students consider the "pitfalls" of their choices, how effectively the students circumvent/counter these "pitfalls," and how effectively the students remain true to their linguistic/rhetorical approach. Aligned with a labor-based grading framework, the students' grades are determined by the extent to which they adhered to the instructor-set assignment guidelines and the extent to which they met their self-determined goals and objectives. Moreover, feedback on the students' work is driven by not only the instructor-set assignment guidelines but also the students' personal goals for the assignment, their intentions for language use, and their own assessments of the strengths and weaknesses within their work (Williams, 2021d).

To facilitate a transparent, community-oriented, and conversational assessment process, students provide insight on their linguistic and rhetorical thinking by submitting brief responses to four reflective questions for each assignment:

1. *Aside from simply meeting the requirements, what were your personal goals for this assignment?*

2. *When reviewing your language choices, what choices did you make to approach your goals for staying within or moving beyond conventions for academic writing?*

3. *What parts of your work on this assignment are you most proud of?*

4. *What challenged you in this assignment and/or where do you need additional support from your instructor?*

Instructors use this information to provide students with suggestions for improving their work to better align with both the instructor-set assignment guidelines, and more importantly, the students' own goals and objectives. After receiving feedback, students have an opportunity to revise and resubmit their work to earn points for "additional labor." Students maintain and assert their ownership of their work by submitting responses to the following revision reflection questions:

1. *Which areas of feedback did you choose to address in your revised version and why?*

2. *How did you address this feedback in your revised version?*

3. *Which areas of feedback did you choose not to address in your revised version and why?*

In this assessment process, student grades are separate from instructor feedback—meaning that students are graded based on their labor or the good faith effort they expend to meet both the instructor-given and their self-determined goals and objectives for the assignment, not on whether they "fix" their work to appease the instructor's thoughts, opinions and standards (Williams, 2021d).

Justly assessing students' writing, or the writing of any author, that does not conform to traditional notions of academic English requires intentional, mindful, and reflexive reading. Inoue's (2020) work on antiracist reading facilitates just writing assessment by encouraging faculty to focus and consider questions such as

- *What details or words in this text am I judging, evaluating, or responding to?*

- *Which two habits of White language might my response participate in or activate?*

- *How can I read my own ideas or response as participating in these two habits?*

- *What experiences or biases (ideas and values) do I have that make my response in this case?*

- *Where did my habits come from in my life? Where did I get them, what do they afford me, and how do they limit me? (p.153)*

Working through these questions allows faculty to identify and call out the ways in which their reading and assessment of a body of writing reinforce white language supremacy. It is only through this intentional, reflexive process that faculty are able to correct their judgments and to evaluate students' writing in a raciolinguistically just manner. Similarly, an antiracist reading framework can be used to guide students' reading of professionally authored works, along with their reading of their own work and the work of their classmates (peer review). As Inoue (2020) reminded us, "In these mindful moments of attending to ourselves, to our biases and fast thinking, to our habits of language, to the structures and systems around us that make us and that we make, to the small but important ways we make sense of words and our world, we can do antiracist work" (p. 154).

PAUSE, BREATHE, REFLECT...

Beyond the Classroom: Raciolinguistic Praxis for Institutional Inclusion

As college literacy and learning professionals committed to raciolinguistic praxis, we are heartened to see the growing number of postsecondary education organizations that have produced materials and self-assessment tools to support institutional equity. These organizations make powerful and necessary contributions to creating equity practices and reforms in higher education. For example, the Center for Urban Education (CUE) offers the Equity Scorecard as a process and a data tool for establishing an on-campus equity team, evaluating institutional data to uncover existing inequities, developing an action plan, and assessing its effectiveness (CUE, 2020). Although the scorecard has been transformative in a variety of academic and non-academic spaces (Dowd, n.d.; Durham Beltline for Everybody, n.d.; USC, 2005), the scorecard's equity indicators lack attention to language practices. As outlined above, such a focus on race alone is incomplete. Instead, a raciolinguistic justice perspective should be infused into campus inclusion work. Of particular importance is recognizing the interconnections between race, language, and power in campus climate (Campbell, 2016; Jones & Phillips, 2020; Rankins & Reason, 2005), belonging (Marshall et al., 2012; Strayhorn et al., 2015; Strayhorn,

2018), and institutional hiring practices (Zuhra & Ardavan, 2020). Importantly, as noted in the reflexivity statement, embracing raciolinguistic justice requires systemic change. While exploring these practices is beyond the scope of the present white paper, we authors call upon our professional community to continue working towards raciolinguistic justice throughout higher education.

Maintaining Hope in the Response to Resistance

Despite the necessity of pedagogical and curricular changes rooted in antiracist and critical language awareness, not all students, faculty, and staff will be receptive to this work. Bernfeld (2020), for instance, discusses white, monolingual students' and faculty's resistance to multilingual, multicultural texts. In their coauthored piece, Taiyon Coleman and colleagues (2016) similarly describe their ongoing struggles to address issues ranging from curricular diversity to diverse hiring practices. The practitioner-scholars frankly discussed how "things institutionally broke down" and their ongoing experiences three years later, as aspects of their teaching and relationships remain "still broken and breaking" (p. 248) as the authors continue to support culturally diverse students at an urban two-year college.

Bernfeld situates resistance to antiracist education within larger discourses of white privilege, anti-immigrant sentiment, and English-only policies. In particular, Bernfeld also cautions against superficial engagement or development of a false sense of familiarity with multilingual, multicultural literature. Lourdes Torres (2007), Anastasia Lakhitikova (2017) and others explain how working beyond these challenges requires awareness of how meaning can be represented differently in different codes and languages, acknowledging and working past one's own linguistic biases, and sitting with discomfort and uncertainty when confronting privilege—all of which are essential to the reflexive work of raciolinguistic justice (see also Bernfeld, 2020; Watt, 2007, 2009). Although this work may seem unending and the challenges insurmountable, antiracist pedagogy is also informed by Derrick Bell's (1992) call for Racial Realism and the movement's resulting commitment to struggling for justice. The recognition of this struggle for justice itself is a manifestation of humanity that grows stronger through its very existence–even if we ourselves never see the work fully overcome the oppression it challenges.

Concluding Thoughts: Counterbalancing Pain and Rage with Hope and Joy

As postsecondary literacy and learning professionals committed to raciolinguistic justice, we fully acknowledge the psychological and emotional dimensions of this work towards raciolinguistic justice—as it is fraught with pain and rage. This work is especially taxing for professionals and students from minoritized groups whose daily lived experiences are entrenched in and so negatively impacted by an oppressive, inequitable, and unjust system. We also recognize the toll this work can take on those from privileged groups who must recognize and come to grips with the ways in which they benefit from and perpetuate this system. Although the experiences of the minoritized and the privileged within this system vastly differ, it is imperative that we all recognize ourselves as co-laborers in this work towards systems change. Our vantage points and our pain points cannot be compared, but both are essential to building an equitable and just society—raciolinguistically and otherwise.

With this, we celebrate the beauty to be found in collectively resisting oppression, in exercising our agency, and in imagining and working towards a system that is equitable and just for all. As part of our ongoing reflexive journeys, it is crucial that we counterbalance the pain with joy. Indeed, there is great joy in fully asserting our humanity and birthright. Indeed, there is great joy in the liberating power of raciolinguistic justice. We must remain hopeful even as we rage. We must remain optimistic even as we resist. We must continually assure ourselves and one another that equity and justice are possible and that it is only through our pain and our rage and our hope and our joy that equity and justice will be realized.

REFERENCES

Abawi, Z., & Eizadirad, A. (2020). Bias-free or biased hiring? Racialized teachers' perspectives on educational hiring practices in Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 193*, 18–31.

Alim, H. S. (2009, February). Race-ing language, languaging race. In *CLIC 2009 Symposium on Race & Ethnicity in Language, Interaction, and Culture. UCLA.*

Alim, H. S. (2016). Introducing raciolinguistics. In H. S. Alim, J. R. Rickford, & A. F. Ball, (Eds.), *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. (pp. 1–30). Oxford University Press.

Allen, M. (2017). The relevance of critical race theory: Impact on students of color. *Urban Education Research & Policy Annuals, 5*(1), 33–44.

Armstrong, S. L. (2020). What's been keeping me awake at night: The future (?) of "The Field." *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 50*(2), 56–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2020.1750849

Attewell, P., Lavin, D., Domina, T., & Levey, T. (2006). New evidence on college remediation. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(5), 886–924. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2006.11778948

Auer, J. (1988). A conversational analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller (Ed.) *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. (pp. 187-213). Walter de Gruyter.

Baca, I., Driskill, Q., Green, D. F., Inoue, A., Jackson, A., Lovejoy, K. B., Muhammad, R., Richardson, E., Smitherman, G., Troutman, D., Villanueva, V., Williams, B., & Zentella, A.C. (2021). *CCCC's statement on white language supremacy*. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/white-language-supremacy

Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.

Baker-Bell, A., Williams-Farrier, B. J., Jackson, D., Johnson, L., Kynard, C., McMurtry, T. (2020). *This ain't another statement! This is a DEMAND for Black linguistic justice!* Conference on College Composition and Communication. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/demand-for-black-linguistic-justice

Bailey, T., Jeong, D. W., & Cho, S. W. (2010). Referral, enrollment, and completion in developmental education sequences in community colleges. *Economics of Education Review, 29*(2), 255–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.09.002

Bauer, L., & Theado, C. K. (2014). Examining the "social turn" in postsecondary literacy research and instruction: A retrospective view of *JCRL* scholarship, 2005–2013. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 45*(1), 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2014.950869

Bell, D. (1992). Racial realism. *Connecticut Law Review, 24*(2), 363–379.

Bernfeld, T. (2020). El futuro es multilingüe: Moving from monolingual resistance to engagement with multilingual texts. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 50*(2), 113–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2020.1737596

Bernstein, B. (2018). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge, education, and cultural change* (pp. 365–392). Routledge.

Bernstein, S. N. (2004). Writing and white privilege: Beyond basic skills. *Pedagogy, 4*(1), 128-131.

Boston, G. H., & Baxley, T. (2007). Living the literature: Race, gender construction, and Black female adolescents. *Urban Education, 42*(6), 560–581. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085907305186

Brathwaite, J., & Edgecombe, N. (2018). Developmental education reform outcomes by subpopulation. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2018*(182), 21–29. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20298

Brooks, W., Browne, S., & Hampton, G. (2008). "There ain't no accounting for what folks see in their own mirrors": Considering colorism within a Sharon Flake narrative. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 51*(8), 660–669. https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.51.8.5

Bruch, P. L., & Reynolds, T. (2012). Ideas in practice: Toward a participatory approach to program assessment. *Journal of Developmental Education, 35*(3), 12–22.

Brunsma, D. L., Embrick, D. G., & Shin, J. H. (2017). Graduate students of color: Race, racism, and mentoring in the white waters of academia. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 3*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2332649216681565

Buell, M. Z. (2012). Negotiating textual authority: Response cycles for a personal statement of a Latina undergraduate. *Journal of Basic Writing 31*(2), 5–31. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43443923

Burns, M. S., Cream, R., & Dougherty, T. R. (2018). Fired up: Institutional critique, lesson study, and the future of antiracist writing assessment. In M. Poe, A. Inoue, & N. Elliott (Eds.), *Writing assessment, social justice, and the advancement of opportunity* (pp. 257–292). WAC Clearinghouse.

Caldera, A., & Babino, A. (2019). Moving toward culturally sustaining language instruction that resists white language supremacy. *National Journal of Middle-Grades Reform, 3*, 9–15.

Caldera, A., & Babino, A. (2020). Being a conduit and culprit of white language supremacy: A duo autohistoria-teoría. *Trayectorias Humanas Transcontinentales*, (8), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.25965/trahs.2660

Calliou, B., & Wesley-Esquimaux, C. (2010). Best practices in aboriginal community development: A wise practices approach. (unpublished report, the Banff Centre, Indigenous Leadership and Management.) https://www.banffcentre.ca/sites/default/files/Lougheed%20Leadership/Research/Indigenous/2_Chapter_1.pdf

Campbell, B. (2016). Utilizing an African American studies course to garner critical consciousness among students: Considerations for improving campus climate. *Journal of Pan African Studies, 9*(8), 26–42.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Canagarajah, S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication, 57*(4), 586–619. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20456910

Canagarajah, A. S. (1997). Safe houses in the contact zone: Coping strategies of African-American students in the academy. *College Composition and Communication, 48*(2), 173–196. https://www.jstor.org/stable/358665

Carson, M., Brewer, C., Williams, J. L, & Armstrong, S. L. (2021). Problematize, theorize, politicize, and contextualize: A social justice framework for postsecondary integrated reading and writing instruction. In Ozaki, C. C. & Parson, L. (Eds.) *Teaching and Learning for Social Justice and Equity in Education*, (pp. 221-224). Palgrave Macmillan.

Carter, S., Honeyford, M., McKaskle, D., Guthrie, F., Mahoney, S., & Carter, G. (2007). "What do you mean by whiteness?": A professor, four doctoral students, and a student affairs administrator explore whiteness. *College Student Affairs Journal, 26*(2), 152–159.

Center for Organizational Responsibility and Advancement. (2021). *About Us*. https://coralearning.org/about/

Center for Urban Education. (2020). *Laying the groundwork: Concepts and activities for racial equity work*. Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California.

Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanič, R., & Martin‐Jones, M. (1991). Critical language awareness part II: Towards critical alternatives. *Language and Education, 5*(1), 41–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500789109541298

Clark, R., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Critical language awareness*. Multilingual Matters Limited.

Clary-Lemon, J. (2009). The racialization of composition studies: Scholarly rhetoric of race since 1990. *College Composition and Communication, 61*(2), 1–17.

Coleman, T. J., DeLong, R., DeVore, K. S., Gibney, S., & Kuhne, M. C. (2016). The risky business of engaging racial equity in writing instruction: A tragedy in five acts. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 43*(4), 347–370.

Coles, N., & Wall, S. V. (1987). Conflict and power in the reader-responses of adult basic writers. *College English, 49*(3), 298–314. https://www.jstor.org/stable/377929

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* Routledge.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1974). Students' Right to Their Own Language. Special Issue. *CCC 25*. https://cdn.ncte.org/nctefiles/groups/cccc/newsrtol.pdf

Davis Jr., O.L. (1997). Beyond "best practice" toward wise practices. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 13*(1), 1–5.

de Kleine, C., & Lawton, R. (2015). *Meeting the needs of linguistically diverse students at the college level.* Oak Creek, WI: College Reading & Learning Association.

Dew, D. F. (2003). Language matters: Rhetoric and writing I as content course. *Writing Program Administrators, 26*(3), 87–104.

DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism.* Beacon Press.

Dixson, A., & Rousseau, C. (2006). *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song.* Routledge.

Doan, J. (2011). The impact of campus climate and student involvement on students of color. *The Vermont Connection, 32*(1), 4, 32–39.

Dowd, A. C. (n.d.). Approaches to measuring quality in higher education. https://sites.nationalacademies.org/cs/groups/dbassesite/documents/webpage/dbasse_171320.pdf

Downs, D., & Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions: (Re)envisioning "first-year composition" as "introduction to writing studies." *College Composition and Communication, 58*(4), 552–584. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20456966

Durham Beltline for Everybody. (n.d.). Minneapolis West Side Community Organization has created a draft of an equity scorecard for development. https://durhambeltlineforeverybody.org/equity-scorecards

Dutro, E., Kazemi, B., Balf, R., & Lin, Y. (2008). The aftermath of 'you're only half': Multiracial identities in the literacy classroom. *Language Arts, 83*(2), 96–106.

Ellis, A. K. (2020). White supremacy culture and capitalism as co-dependent systems of oppression. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4339&context=honors_theses

Erdmann, N. (2021). *Defining: Equality, equity, and justice.* https://achievebrowncounty.org/2021/05/defining-equity-equality-and-justice/

Faigley, L. (1992). *Fragments of rationality: Postmodernity and the subject of composition*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171.

Gallagher, J. (2020). There's levels to this: Code-meshing in a community college classroom. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 50*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2019.1693938

Garner, S. (2007). *Whiteness: An introduction*. Routledge.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106–116.

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* Teachers College Press.

Grayson, M. L. (2017). Race talk in the composition classroom: Narrative song lyrics as texts for racial literacy. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 45*(2), 143–167.

Greenbaum, J., & Angus, K. B. (2018). Rights of postsecondary readers and learners. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 48*(2), 138–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2017.1379891

Grue, M. N. P. (2020). An Afrofuturisticvehicle for literacy instruction. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 50*(1), 33–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2019.1693937

Guinier, L. (2004). From racial liberalism to racial literacy: Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-divergence dilemma. *Journal of American History, 91*(1), 92–118.

Hanson, F. A. (1993). *Testing testing: Social consequence of the examined life.* University of California Press.

Harper, S. R. (2013). Am I my brother's teacher? Black undergraduates, racial socialization, and peer pedagogies in predominantly white postsecondary contexts. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 183–211. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12471300

Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education, 36*(1), 9–29.

Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review, 106*(8), 1707–1791. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1341787

Harris III, F., & Bensimon, E. M. (2007). The equity scorecard: A collaborative approach to assess and respond to racial/ethnic disparities in student outcomes. *New Directions for Student Services, 2007*(120), 77–84. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.259

Hawkman, A. M. (2020). Swimming in and through whiteness: Antiracism in social studies teacher education. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 48*(3), 403–430. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2020.1724578

Hooks, B. (2014). *Teaching to transgress.* Routledge.

Howell, N. G., Navickas, K., Shapiro, R., Shapiro, S., & Watson, M. (2020, June). Embracing the perpetual 'but' in raciolinguistic justice work: When idealism meets practice. *Composition Forum,* (44). Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition.

Hull, G. (1993). Critical literacy and beyond: Lessons learned from students and workers in a vocational program and on the job. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 24*(4), 373–396. https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.1993.24.4.04x0066n

Inman, J. O., & Powell, R. A. (2018). In the absence of grades: Dissonance and desire in course-contract classrooms. *College Composition and Communication, 70*(1), 30–56.

Inoue, A. B. (2005). Community-based assessment pedagogy. *Assessing Writing, 9*(3), 208–238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2004.12.001

Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future.* Parlor Press.

Inoue, A. B. (2019a). Classroom writing assessment as an antiracist practice: Confronting white supremacy in the judgments of language. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture, 19*(3), 373–404. https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-7615366

Inoue, A. (2019b). How do we language so people stop killing each other, or what do we do about white language supremacy? Transcript of 2018 Conference on College Composition and Communication Annual Convention keynote address. https://docs.google.com/document/d/11ACklcUmqGvTzCMPlETChBwS-Ic3t2BOLi13u8IUEp4/edit

Inoue, A. B. (2020). Teaching antiracist reading. *Journal of College Reading and Learning.* https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2020.1787079

Inoue, A. B. (2021). *Above the well: An antiracist literacy argument from a boy of color.* University Press of Colorado.

Janks, H. (2013). Critical literacy in teaching and research. *Education Inquiry, 4*(2), 225–242. https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v4i2.22071

Jones, S. M., & Phillips, G. A. (2020). Re-imagining campus climate assessment at HBCUs. *Research & Practice in Assessment, 15*(2), 1–13.

Kareem, J. (2019). A critical race analysis of transition-level writing curriculum to support the racially diverse two-year college. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 46*(4), 271–296.

Kendi, I. X. (2019). *How to be an antiracist.* One World.

Kishimoto, K. (2018). Anti-racist pedagogy: From faculty's self-reflection to organizing within and beyond the classroom. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 21*(4), 540–554. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248824

Kynard, C. (2015). Teaching while black: Witnessing and countering disciplinary whiteness, racial violence, and university race-management. *Literacy in Composition Studies, 3*(1), 1–17.

Kynard, C. (2013). *Vernacular insurrections: Race, Black protest, and the new century in composition-literacies studies.* SUNY Press.

Kynard, C. (2007). "Wanted: Some Black Long Distance [Writers]": Blackboard Flava-Flavin and other AfroDigital experiences in the classroom. *Computers and Composition, 24*(3), 329–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2007.05.008

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3), 229–234. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105275917

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849509543675

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a theory of critical race theory in education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47–68.

Lakhtikova, A. (2017). Code-switching in Anzaldúa's Borderlands/La Frontera and Walcott's Omeros. A literary device for "new readability." *Poroi, 13*(1), 1–31.

Lankshear, C., & McLaren, P. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Critical literacy: Politics, praxis, and the postmodern.* SUNY Press.

Laws, M. (2020). Why we capitalize 'Black' (and not 'white'). *Columbia Journalism Review.* https://www.cjr.org/analysis/capital-b-black-styleguide.php

Lawton, R., & de Kleine, K. (2021). The need to dismantle "standard" language ideology at the community college: An analysis of writing and literacy instructor attitudes. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 50*(4), 197–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2020.1836938

Lee, A. Y., & Handsfield, L. J. (2018). Code☐meshing and writing instruction in multilingual classrooms. *The Reading Teacher, 72*(2), 159–168. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1688

Lerner, N. (2018). WAC journal interview of Asao B. Inoue. *Writing Across the Curriculum Journal, 29*(1), 112-118. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2018.29.1.05

Lesley, M. (2001). Exploring the links between critical literacy and developmental reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 45*(3), 180–189. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40016878

Looker, S. (2016). Writing about language: Studying language diversity with first-year writers. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 44*(2), 176–198.

Love, B. L. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom.* Beacon Press.

Love, B. L. (2014). Urban storytelling: How storyboarding, moviemaking, and hip-hop-based education can promote students' critical voice. *English Journal, 103*(5), 53–58. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24484246

Lu, M.Z. (1994). Professing multiculturalism: The politics of style in the contact zone. *College Composition and Communication, 45*(4), 442–458. https://www.jstor.org/stable/358759

Lyons, S. R. (2000). Rhetorical sovereignty: What do American Indians want from writing? *College Composition and Communication, 51*(3), 447–468. https://www.jstor.org/stable/358744

Marshall, S., Zhou, M., Gervan, T., & Wiebe, S. (2012). Sense of belonging and first-year academic literacy. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 43*(3), 116–142.

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in US college composition. *College English, 68*(6), 637–651. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25472180

McNair, T. B., Bensimon, E. M., & Malcom-Piqueux, L. (2020). *From equity talk to equity walk: Expanding practitioner knowledge for racial justice in higher education.* John Wiley & Sons.

Medzerian, S. (2010). Style and the pedagogy of response. *Rhetoric Review, 29*(2), 186–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/07350191003613468

Miller-Cochran, S. (2012). Beyond ESL writing: Teaching cross-cultural composition at a community college. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 40*(1), 20–30.

Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (2012). *Authority in language: Investigating standard English.* Routledge.

Morrell, E. (2003). *Writing the word and the world: Critical literacy as critical textual production.* [Conference presentation]. College Composition and Communication 2003 Conference, New York, NY, United States. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED475208.pdf

Motch-Ellis, W. (2019). *Equity, diversity, and inclusion: A resource guide for leaders in collegiate recreation.* https://nirsa.net/nirsa/wp-content/ uploads/nirsa-equity-diversity-inclusion-resourceguide-for-campus-recreation.pdf

Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y., Griffin, K. E., Davidoff, K., & Sriken, J. (2014). The adverse impact of racial microaggressions on college students' self-esteem. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(5), 461–474. https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_pubs/199

Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 7*(3), 240–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710903414331

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X12441244

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 85–100.

Pavesich, M. (2011). Reflecting on the liberal reflex: Rhetoric and the politics of acknowledgement in basic writing. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 84–109. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43443918

Perryman-Clark, S. M. (2012). Toward a pedagogy of linguistic diversity: Understanding African American linguistic practices and programmatic learning goals. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 39*(3), 230–246.

Preston, D. C. (2017). *Untold barriers for Black students in higher education: Placing race at the center of developmental education.* Southern Education Foundation.

Pruitt, J. (2015). Heterosexual readers in search of queer authenticity through self-selected LGBT novels. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 42*(4), 359–374.

Rankins-Robertson, S., Cahill, L., Roen, D., & Glau, G. R. (2010). Expanding definitions of academic writing: Family history writing in the basic writing classroom and beyond. *Journal of Basic Writing, 29*(1), 56–77.

Rankins, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(1), 43–61.

Richardson, E. (2003). *African American literacies.* Routledge.

Rickford, J. R. (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race.* Oxford University Press.

Rogers, R, & Mosley, M. (2008). A critical discourse analysis of racial literacy in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education: An International Research Journal, 19*(2), 107–131.

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society, 46*(5), 621–647.

Sanchez, D. M., & Paulson, E. J. (2008). Critical language awareness and learners in college. *Teaching English in the Two Year College, 36*(2), 164–176.

Sealy-Ruiz, Y. (2013). Building racial literacy in first-year composition. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 40*(4) 384–398.

Sealey-Ruiz, Y. (2021). Racial literacy. A policy research brief. *National Council of Teachers of English*, 1-8. https://ncte.org/resources/policy-briefs/

Shapiro, S. (in press). *Cultivating critical language awareness in the writing classroom*. Routledge.

Shelton, C. D. (2014). Disrupting authority: Writing mentors and code-meshing pedagogy. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 12*(1) 77–83.

Sheridan, D. (2020). *Illustrations addressing imbalance.* https://medium.com/fact-of-the-day-1/illustrations-addressing-imbalance-2a59435f3e97

Skerrett, A. (2011). English teachers' racial literacy knowledge and practice. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 14*(3), 313–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2010.543391

Smalls, K. A., Spears, A. K., & Rosa, J. (2021). Introduction: Language and White supremacy. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 31*(2), 152–156.

Smitherman, G. (2017). Raciolinguistics, 'mis-education,' and language arts teaching in the 21st century. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan, 32*(2), 4–12. https://doi.org/10.9707/2168-149X.2164

Smitherman, G. (2003). The historical struggle for language rights in CCCC. In G. Smitherman and V. Villanueva (Eds.), *From intention to practice: Considerations of language diversity in the classroom.* Southern Illinois University Press, (pp. 7–39).

Smitherman, G. (1999). CCCC's role in the struggle for language rights. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(3), 349–376.

Smitherman, G. (1986). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America* (Vol. 51). Wayne State University Press.

Stanley, S. (2017). From a whisper to a voice: Sociocultural style and anti-racist pedagogy. *Journal of Basic Writing, 36*(2), 5–25.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2018). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students.* Routledge.

Strayhorn, T. L., Lo, M. T., Travers, C. S., & Tillman-Kelly, D. L. (2015). Assessing the relationship between well-being, sense of belonging, and confidence in the transition to college for Black male collegians. *Spectrum: A Journal on Black Men, 4*(1), 127–138.

Strevens, P. (1981). What Is 'Standard English'? *RELC Journal, 12*(2), 1–9.

Suh, E. K., McGee, B., & Owens, S. (in press). When bootstraps break: Re-examining assumptions about the symbolic capital of immigrant students' personal persistence narratives. *Journal of Basic Writing, 40*(1).

Suh, E. K., Owens, S., O'Meara, E., & Hall, L. (2021). *Clarifying terms and reestablishing ourselves within justice: A response to critiques of developmental education as anti-equity.* National Organization for Student Success.

Sullivan, P. (2015). The two-year college teacher-scholar-activist. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 42*(4), 327–350.

Tay, M. W. (1989). Code switching and code mixing as a communicative strategy in multilingual discourse. *World Englishes, 8*(3), 407–417.

Torres, L. (2007). In the contact zone: Code-switching strategies by Latino/a writers. *Melus, 32*(1), 75–96.

Toth, C. (2013). Beyond assimilation: Tribal colleges, basic writing, and the exigencies of settler colonialism. *Journal of Basic Writing, 32*(1), 4–36.

Toth, C. (2018). Directed self-placement at "democracy's open door": Writing placement and social justice in community colleges. In M. Poe, A. Inoue, & N. Elliott (Eds.), *Writing assessment, social justice, and the advancement of opportunity* (pp.137–170). WAC Clearinghouse. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2018.0155.2.04

Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2013). *International English: A guide to the varieties of standard English.* Routledge.

University of Southern California. (2005). Measuring equity in higher education: An accountability framework for California colleges and universities. https://cue.usc.edu/files/2016/01/CPI_Seder_Measuring_Equity_in_Higher_Education_2005.pdf

Vetter, A., & Hungerford-Kresser, H. (2014). 'We gotta change first': Racial literacy in a high school English classroom. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 10*(1), 82–99.

Walker, L. (2016). Impact of academic support centers on students with disabilities in postsecondary institutions. *Learning Assistance Review, 21*(1), 81–92.

Wallace, C. (1999). Critical language awareness: Key principles for a course in critical reading. *Language awareness, 8*(2), 98–110.

Watt, S. K. (2009). Facilitating difficult dialogues at the intersections of religious privilege. *New Directions for Student Services, 2009*(125), 65–73.

Watt, S. K. (2007). Difficult dialogues, privilege and social justice: Uses of the privileged identity exploration (PIE) model in student affairs practice. *College Student Affairs Journal, 26*(2), 114–126.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing.* Ernst Klett Sprachen.

West-Puckett, S. (2016). Making classroom writing assessment more visible, equitable, and portable through digital badging. *College English, 79*(2), 127–151.

Williams, J. (2009). Teaching the revolution: Critical literacy in the college reading classroom. *LLC Review, 9*(1), 36–47.

Williams, J. (2010) *Representation, engagement and agency for African American students in postsecondary literacy instruction: A critical qualitative content analysis of current developmental reading textbooks.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Maryland, Baltimore County.

Williams, J. (2012a). Using a critical literacy model to foster critical reflections on race, social class, and education among developmental readers. *Affective Reading Education Journal, 27,* 36–44.

Williams, J. (2012b). Engaging developmental reading students: A critical literacy model. *Innovative Learning Strategies Twenty-First Biennial Yearbook 2010–2012* (pp. 1–11). Chicago: IL, College Literacy and Learning Special Interest Group, International Reading Association.

Williams, J. L. (2013). Representations of the racialized experiences of African Americans in developmental reading textbooks. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 43*(2), 39–69.

Williams, J. L. (2021a, January 20). Breaking the cycle of curriculum violence. Williams Higher Education Consulting, LLC. https://williamshighered.com/breaking-the-cycle-of-curriculum-violence/

Williams, J. L. (2021b, February 25). Equity and justice start from within: Reflexivity and nonviolent literacy instruction. *Williams Higher Education Consulting, LLC.* https://williamshighered.com/starting-from-within-reflexivity-and-nonviolent-literacy-instruction/

Williams, J. L. (2021c, March 23). Restoring joy: Critical language awareness and linguistic dexterity. *Williams Higher Education Consulting, LLC.* https://williamshighered.com/restoring-joy-critical-language-awareness-and-linguistic-dexterity/

Williams, J. L. (2021d). A framework for raciolinguistically just literacy instruction. *Williams Higher Education Consulting, LLC.* https://williamshighered.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Raciolinguistic-Justice-Framework.pdf

Wood, L. (n.d.). Black minds matter: A focus on black boys and men in education. https://jlukewood.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/black-minds-matter-syllabus-2.pdf

Yosso, T., Parker, L., Solorzano, D., & Lynn, M. (2004). From Jim Crow to affirmative action and back again: A critical race discussion of racialized rationales and access to higher education. *Review of Research in Education, 28*, 1–26.

Young, V. A. (2020). Black lives matter in academic spaces: Three lessons for critical literacy. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 50*(1), 5–18.

Young, V. A. (2009). "Nah, we straight": An argument against code switching. *Journal of Composition Theory, 29*(1), 49–76.

Young, V. A., & Barrett, R. (2018). *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy.* Parlor Press.

Young, V. A., & Martinez, A. (2011). Code-meshing as world English: Policy, pedagogy, and performance. National Council of Teachers of English.

APPENDIX: GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY

Equity: *Equity* is "about teaching the culturally and linguistically diverse students who actually sit with us, not the students others assume are there. It's about the opportunity to transition successfully to higher education. It's about learners' rights to a theoretically sound and evidence-based curriculum developed by expert educators. It's about honoring learners' existing languages, literacies, and numeracies, but still ensuring they have access to power discourses in academic contexts. It's about demanding that all have opportunities to engage as active, critical, thoughtful citizens. And at this moment, for me, that is at the top of my list of the most important social justice issues" (Armstrong, 2021, p. 64).

For further conversations about equity, we recommend Motch-Ellis (2019); McNair et al. (2020); Suh et al. (2021).

Inclusion: *Inclusion* is "the conscious practice of actively engaging people of different backgrounds [and] requires the integration of individuals' experiences, knowledge, and perspectives, while acknowledging our shared history and continually reflecting on issues of power and privilege. The intentional goal of an Inclusive Community is the full and equal participation of all" (Motch-Ellis, 2019, p. 2).

For further conversations about inclusion, we recommend Sullivan (2015); Walker (2016).

Justice: *Justice* is "fixing the system to offer equal access to both tools and opportunities" (Sheridan, 2020, para 1). Erdmann (2020) explains that justice is "long-term equity [that] looks to create equity in systems as well as in individuals" (para. 4).

For further conversations about justice, we recommend Baker-Bell et al. (2020); Baker-Bell (2020); Pavesich (2011).

Raciolinguistic Justice: Howell et al. (2020) describes the practice of *raciolinguistic justice* as, "subverting racism's hold on language use in the classroom and beyond" (para. 4).

For further conversations about raciolinguistic justice, we recommend this white paper.

Raciolinguistics: Rosa and Flores (2017) describe *raciolinguistics* as the interconnected relationship between language and race, which leads to "the linguistic practices of racialized populations [who] are systematically stigmatized regardless of the extent to which these practices might seem to correspond to standardized norms" (Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 623).

For further conversations about raciolinguistics, we recommend Alim et al. (2016); Flores & Rosa (2015); Rickford (2016).

Racism: Harper (2012) defines *racism* as "individual actions (both intentional and unconscious) that engender marginalization and inflict varying degrees of harm on minoritized persons; structures that determine and cyclically remanufacture racial inequity; and institutional norms that sustain white privilege and permit the ongoing subordination of minoritized persons" (p. 10).

For further conversations about racism, we recommend Allen (2017); DiAngelo, (2018); Inoue (2015); McNair et al., (2020); Williams (2013).

Standard English: Lawton and de Kleine (2020) explain that there is "no agreed upon definition" (p. 204) of standard English. However, there are themes noted throughout practitioners' understanding of *standard English*, such as "academic English," "rule-governed language," and "linguistic criteria" (Lawton & de Kleine, 2020, p. 204–207).

For further conversations about standard English we recommend Milroy & Milroy (2012); Perera (2020); Strevens (1981); Trudgill & Hannah (2013).

White Language Supremacy: *White language supremacy* "assists white supremacy by using language to control reality and resources by defining and evaluating people, places, things, reading, writing, rhetoric, pedagogies, and processes in multiple ways that damage our students and our democracy. It imposes a worldview that is simultaneously pro-white, cisgender, male, heteronormative, patriarchal, ableist, racist, and capitalist (Inoue, 2019b; Pritchard, 2017). This worldview structures WLS as the default condition in schools, academic disciplines, professions, media, and society at large. WLS is, thus, structural and usually a part of the standard operating procedures of classrooms, disciplines, and professions" (Baca et al., 2021, para. 5).

For further conversations about white language supremacy, we recommend Caldera & Babino (2019); Inoue (2019); Smalls et al. (2021).

White Supremacy: *White supremacy* refers to "the all-encompassing centrality and assumed superiority of people defined and perceived as white and the practices based on this assumption (DiAngelo, 2018, p. 28). Importantly, white supremacy is not a descriptor of individual white people, their intentions or actions. Instead, it refers to an overarching political, economic, and social system of domination. White supremacy's power is maintained by invisibility and the "taken-for-granted aspects that underwrite all other political and social contracts" (p. 29).

The power of white supremacy is also seen in the way we write. For example, when explaining why we ought to capitalize the term Black, but not white, Laws (2020) explains, "White carries a different set of meanings; capitalizing the word in this context risks following the lead of white supremacists" (para 1).

For further conversations about white supremacy, we recommend DiAngelo (2018); Ellis (2020); Inoue (2019).

Whiteness: The term *whiteness* is conceptualized as "a hegemonic system that perpetuates certain dominant ideologies about who receives power and privilege. Whiteness maintains itself in cultures through power dynamics within language, religion, class, race relations, sexual orientation, etc." (Carter et al., 2007, p. 152). Whiteness results in *white privilege* for white people, but causes harm to BIPOC. Hawkman (2020) notes, "White folks often choose not to see whiteness, but it surrounds them, and they struggle to live beyond it. Yet, for Black, Indigenous, and People/Person(s) of Color (BIPOC), whiteness is a visible and ever-present challenge to their humanity" (p. 404).

For further conversations about whiteness, we recommend Ellis (2020); Garner (2007); Harris (1993).

Wise Practices: *Wise practices* are "best defined as locally-appropriate actions, tools, principles or decisions that contribute significantly to the development of sustainable and equitable conditions" (Calliou & Wesley-Esquimaux, 2010, p. 19). Rather than aspiring to be universal, as best practices try to be, wise practices are "idiosyncratic, contextual, textured, and probably inconsistent" (Davis, 1997, p.4).

For further conversations about wise practices, we recommend Calliou and Wesley-Esquimaux (2010); Davis (1997).