Introduction to Volume 22, Issue 1-2

Michael J. Cripps, University of New England

I am pleased to announce that we have finalized important changes to our journal's editorial practices, which you can now find on *ATD*'s Submissions page at https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/submissions/. Over the last 18 months or so, we have been working to update our practices by taking as a starting point the 2021 "Anti-racist scholarly reviewing practices: A heuristic for editors, reviewers, and authors." Our intention is to improve the journal's practices and strengthen its commitment to equity, inclusion, linguistic justice, and multilingualism. Hannah Locher, *ATD's* Susan H. McLeod New Scholar Fellow in 2023-24, worked most directly with Associate Editor Julia Voss on this effort. Hannah surveyed other journals' efforts and inventoried of our own practices as background work that informed revisions to our style guide, submission instructions, and reviewing guidelines. Since finishing her fellowship, Hannah has continued to work with us as Editorial Equity and Sustainability Consultant. Our revisions align *ATD*'s policies and practices with those of the WAC Clearinghouse, improve transparency for authors, and enhance inclusion.

These changes affect both authors and reviewers. Beginning August 2025, *ATD* will only accept new submissions via the WAC Clearinghouse Submissions portal at https://submissions.colostate.edu/. Beginning Fall 2025, reviewers will be asked to use the portal to retrieve manuscripts and submit their reviews. It will take time to fully make the transition to the portal, as a manuscript may take 6-12 months to move from original submission through review and eventual publication.

For authors, we aim to be transparent about our process and anticipated timelines. While many of these details simply make visible our existing practices, we recognize that a lack of transparency can be a barrier that prevents new voices from joining the conversation. By sharing with authors (and reviewers) our expectations for reviewers, we hope to further demystify *ATD*'s processes. Our efforts to enhance inclusion do involve new work for prospective authors. We are asking authors to attend to the inclusivity of the scholarship with which they engage, include alt text and captions for images or graphics for accessibility, and position themselves in relation to their subject and methods.

Our Editorial Board and Consulting Readers (our principal reviewers) have previously read about the changes for reviewers because we have asked them to commit to them. Many of the details codify current practice. At the same time, we have drawn together and articulated both key content considerations (relevance, quality, inclusiveness, author positioning) and important formal considerations (APA style and accessibility) to help reviewers in their work. Our hope is that transparency in these expectations will enable authors to anticipate and address possible areas of concern before reviewers engage with a manuscript and offer reviewers more structure as they engage in the hard work of commenting on the strengths and challenges in a manuscript.

This issue includes four articles and two book reviews. The first two articles are quite different in many respects—one focuses on kinesiology students and peer review, and the other focuses on writing in calculus. Interestingly, they share a partial emphasis on learners' perceptions regarding their learning through writing. The third article, a case study, underscores the importance of attending to a writing program's web-based materials to ensure that stakeholders can engage meaningfully with the program and its resources. And the fourth article explores the integration of counterargument in writing intensive courses across a range of disciplines. The first book review, by S. Fain Riopelle, examines *Pedagogical Perspectives on Cognition and Writing* (2021), edited by Patricia Portonova, Michael J. Rifenburg, and Duane H. Roen. Shana Scudder rounds out the issue with a review of Christopher N. Puolos's *Essentials of Ethnography* (2021).

In our first article, "Writing Circles in STEM: Why Structured Peer Review Engages Students as Writers, Thinkers, and Collaborators in Their Discipline," Tereza Joy Kramer, Claire Williams, Joe Zeccardi, and Joshua Rose build on work that previously appeared in *Across the Disciplines* (2019, 2022). The current paper will be of interest to STEM faculty, WAC/WID administrators looking for ways to support peer review and the writing process, and individuals seeking to structure effective peer review. Writing Circles are a curriculum-based approach to peer review intended to encourage active learning and collaboration. At St. Mary's College, the institutional site for the research reported by Kramer et al., Writing Circles are 1-credit courses that support students in writing-intensive courses. In this paper, the researchers focus attention on students' perceptions of their gains in collaborating, writing, and thinking by examining their reflection papers. Both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the reflections show that students recognize that they have made meaningful gains in peer collaboration, revision techniques, and confidence as writers.

Tyler Scorczewski and Justin Nicholes, in "Writing to Engage in Multivariate Calculus: Students' Perceptions of Math, Writing, and the Curriculum," examine students' experiences with a series of writing-in-mathematics assignments. In a small-scale, mixed-methods study of likely interest to many faculty and writing program administrators, the authors attempt to tease out some elements of Mike Palmquist's (2020) writing to engage (WTE) framework in the math class. Offered as a kind of middle space between learning to write and writing to learn (in a discipline), WTE recognizes reflection as a cognitive activity involving higher-order learning. By combining a pre- and post-intervention approach involving both quantitative and qualitative data, Scorczewski and Nicholes offer potentially valuable insights into ways that WTE activities can alter students' views of both writing and mathematics. As Scorczewski and Nicholes put it, "participants engage both with content and with the field and its relationship to participants' present and future lives" (p. 53).

Our third contribution to the issue offers readers a case study with important insights into a WAC program's redesign of its publicly facing web materials. "Sustaining User Engagement: Programmatic Visibility and Website Usability for Cross-Curricular Literacy Programs," by Christopher Basgier, Derek Ross, Ed Youngblood, and Hannah Smith, draws together two literatures that are rarely (if ever) in conversation. First, Basgier et al. draw heavily from Michelle Cox, Jeffrey R. Galin, and Dan Melzer's (2018) *Sustainable WAC* and make the case that a program's website is a key vehicle for raising visibility with an institution's stakeholders. Second, the authors draw from the literature on web usability and user experience design. The case study walks readers through the role of usability testing with various stakeholders and key design decisions they made as they reworked the web resources for University Writing at Auburn University to improve visibility and user engagement.

Christy Goldsmith and Julie Birt offer readers an important and timely window into the ways that writing intensive course faculty from a range of disciplines prepare students to consider multiple perspectives in "Embracing Complexity: Contradictions Between Perception and Application of Counterargument in Writing Intensive Assignments." This article will undoubtedly interest many in the WAC/WID community, particularly at institutions that take up the challenges of confirmation bias

and echo chambers. In a mixed-methods study of more than 300 WI course proposals submitted to the University of Missouri-Columbia's Campus Writing Board, Goldsmith and Birt connect the importance of counterargument for critical thinking and civic discourse to writing instruction in undergraduate coursework. A key requirement for a WI designation at Mizzou is an assignment in which students are expected to consider more than one viewpoint, making the program an excellent site for the research. Beyond informing potential next steps in faculty development for their own program, Goldsmith and Birt's findings will likely be of use to WAC program administrators at many institutions, whether they define their approach as WAC, WID, or WEC.

New for 2025, we are acknowledging the important, hard work of reviewing manuscripts for *ATD* by naming the many individuals who read article submissions and offered constructive feedback to authors in 2024. This acknowledgment is another outcome of our work on equity and inclusion. The following individuals contributed their time and careful attention, with more than a few reviewing two manuscripts last year: Charlotte Asmuth, Ellen Carillo, Amy Cicchino, Michelle Crow, Dana Driscoll, Dan Emery, Jeffrey Galin, Kristi Girdharry, Emily Hall, Jonathan Hall, Susanmarie Harrington, Justin Hayes, Neal Lerner, William Macauley, Rebecca Martini, Dan Melzer, Justin Nicholes, Jim Purdy, Justin Rademaekers, Gwendolynne Reid, Paul Rogers, Joanna Schreiber, Nicole Turnipseed, and Roger Yallop. As prospective authors know, our reviewers provide thoughtful and helpful feedback, even when they are raising significant ongoing challenges in a paper under review. As editor, I have the extraordinary privilege of engaging with dozens of reviewer letters each year and know that these individuals' work consistently strengthens the articles that we publish. And in cases where we do not eventually publish a manuscript, I am confident that our reviewers' feedback helps authors consider next steps for their projects. We intend to continue this practice of annually making our reviewers' work visible by naming those who have contributed in the previous year.

We welcome submissions of original manuscripts for review and possible publication in an open issue, as well as inquiries or proposals for special issues. Given the continued growth of Generative AI in both education and the workplace, we would be eager to consider a special issue proposal that could draw together several strands of emerging inquiry in this important, challenging, and rapidly evolving area. Additionally, *ATD* remains open to bringing in more voices and perspectives. We invite individuals whose work intersects with the mission of the journal to reach out to explore reviewing for *ATD.*

References

Anti-racist scholarly reviewing practices: A heuristic for editors, reviewers, and authors. (2021). Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/reviewheuristic

Basgier, Christopher, Ross, Derek, Youngblood, Norman E., & Smith, Hannah. (2025, July 25). Sustaining user engagement: Programmatic visibility and website usability for cross-curricular literacy programs. *Across the Disciplines, 22*(1/2), 62-83. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2025.22.1-2.04

Goldsmith, Christy, & Birt, Julie. (2025, July 25). Embracing complexity: Contradictions between perception and application of counterargument in writing intensive assignments. *Across the Disciplines, 22*(1/2), 84-98. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2025.22.1-2.05

Kramer, Tereza Joy, Zeccardi, Joe, Concepcion, Rebecca, Emhoff, Chi-An, Miller, Steve, & Posell, Krista Varela. (2019, December 28). WID course enhancements in STEM: The impact of adding "writing circles" and writing process pedagogy. *Across the Disciplines, 16*(4), 26-37. http://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/articles/krameretal2019.pdf

Kramer, Tereza Joy, Zeccardi, Joe, Emhoff, Chi-An W., Williams, Claire, Dunn, Robin J., & Rose, Joshua. (2022, February 18). How timing and authority in peer review impact STEM students: A comparative assessment of writing and critical thinking in kinesiology courses. *Across the Disciplines, 18*(3/4), 305-319. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2022.18.3-4.06

Kramer, Tereza Joy, Williams, Claire, Zeccardi, Joe, & Rose, Josh. (2025, July 25). Writing circles in STEM: Why structured peer review engages students as writers, thinkers, and collaborators in their discipline. *Across the Disciplines, 22*(1/2), 5-37. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2025.22.1-2.02

Skorczewski, Tyler, & Nicholes, Justin. (2025, July 25). Writing to engage in multivariate calculus: Students' perceptions of math, writing, and the curriculum. *Across the Disciplines, 22*(1/2), 38-61. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2025.22.1-2.03

Contact Information

Michael J. Cripps
Professor of Rhetoric and Composition
Director, School of Arts and Humanities
University of New England
Email: mcripps@une.edu

Complete APA Citation