

Bringing a Folding Chair to the Table: Building Towards Authentic Equity in Professional Conversations about Developmental Education

Emily K. Suh and Bethany E. Sweeney

ABSTRACT: Developmental education and equity work, both of which are foundational to the work of basic writing, are under attack. In this article, we present a critical discourse analysis of paradigmatic texts representing the unique perspectives of four organizations that have sought to articulate a relationship between developmental education, equity, and their organizational values. By explicating these organizations' conceptualizations of equity and uncovering their particular rhetorical approaches for explicating the connection between developmental education and equity, we invite developmental educators, including basic writing professionals, to consider our own equity language, our assumptions about the work we do, and our preparation for engaging others who do not share our perspectives about the relationship between developmental education and equity in order to advance our shared commitment to student success.

KEYWORDS: critical discourse analysis; developmental education; equity

As self-identified developmental educators and basic writing professionals, we have faced growing threats to our professional identities and the very understanding of developmental education. Accused by the right as being “woke” and part of a larger “grooming process” that is designed to indoctrinate students into narrow ideologies (Spindleman) and labeled by neoliberal policy-driving organizations as antiquated and anti-student (Complete College America, *Time*, *Bridge*; see also McGee et al.), our work to create inclusive, just classrooms is also often overlooked by administrators at our home institutions. As a result, we find it challenging not to exist in a constant state of defensive reaction (Armstrong).

Though understandable, such a state is neither viable nor sustainable as we continue engaging in the work of creating more equitable experiences and outcomes for students—and for society as a whole. We concur with other basic writing and developmental education scholars before us who have argued the need for a unified vision of our field which centers around an assets-based framing of our students (Armstrong; Paulson and Armstrong;

Suh et al. *Raciolinguistic*) rather than popular deficit lenses ascribed to developmental education and the students it serves (Complete College America). In particular, we echo the need for developmental educators to articulate a proactive stance asserting the expertise and necessity of developmental education on its own terms. We acknowledge how all too often, frontline developmental educators do not hold high-status positions to contribute to or control the terms of the debate. Instead, these basic writing instructors, two-year college faculty, contingent faculty, and graduate teaching assistants with first-hand experience of the equity challenges facing students and faculty can feel silenced (and become complicit in self-silencing) in the face of the narratives about developmental education perpetuated by research centers, policy-driving organizations, and politicians (Armstrong; Suh et al. “Unvoicing”).

In response to this current reality, we argue that the field of developmental education, including basic writing professionals, will not achieve validation from the comforts of our disciplinary silos or classrooms and further that developmental educators cannot passively wait for professional or policy-driving organizations to dictate the terms of our work. We draw particular inspiration from the late Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, who famously declared, “If they don’t give you a seat at the table, bring a folding chair” (Bring Your Own Chair). We see the work of making space as requiring developmental educators to proactively engage with other postsecondary stakeholders. This necessitates that we understand the language, goals, and perspectives of the stakeholders with whom we seek to engage and find ways to harness such while maintaining our own longstanding foundational values centering students and community.

As a first step in preparing basic writing professionals to engage in these conversations, we examine the meaning various postsecondary education stakeholder organizations ascribe to the concepts of *equity* and *developmental*

Emily K. Suh is Associate Professor of Postsecondary Student Success and English Language Arts Reading Coordinator at Texas State University. Having spent nearly the first decade of her career teaching in access-oriented institutions, Suh focuses on supporting students’ academic literacy development through her engagement in research, faculty development, and equity-oriented pedagogies.

Bethany E. Sweeney is Professor of English and History and Pathway Academic Chair of History, Political Science, Geography, Anthropology, Global Studies, and Philosophy at Des Moines Area Community College. Her research focuses on transdisciplinary reading practices and cultural rhetorics. She currently serves as Secretary of the Two-Year College English Association.

education and explore the rhetorical tools these groups employ to engage their various audiences regarding the relationship between these terms. We begin by exploring our own positionalities and how our previous experiences have uniquely prepared us to engage in this work. We then present a critical discourse analysis of four paradigmatic texts representing the unique perspectives of distinct organizations which have sought to articulate a relationship between developmental education and equity as well as the organization's own orientation towards equity. By explicating these organizations' conceptualizations of equity and uncovering the related rhetorical approaches they engage, we invite developmental educators to consider our own equity language, our assumptions about the work we do, and our preparation for engaging others who do not share our perspectives about the relationship between developmental education and equity.

In particular, our analysis explored how authors of each text: (1) define equity, (2) use the term, specifically in relation to developmental education, and (3) situate their position on equity and developmental education within broader scholarly or professional literature.

POSITIONALITY

Our analysis and resulting recommendations are shaped by our own unique professional experiences. Emily began teaching developmental writing and reading in 2011 at a Nebraska community college where she worked within the English department and the writing center. The first professional conference she attended was the National Association for Developmental Education (NADE, now the National Organization for Student Success) which included content instructors as well as advisors, tutors, academic coaches, and placement testing professionals. Through NADE and her institutional colleagues, Emily came to identify as a developmental educator, a label which transcended disciplinary boundaries to focus on supporting the advancement of all students. Emily now teaches developmental literacy theory, research, and practice to graduate students and coordinates a developmental literacy program at Texas State University.

As a PhD-holding, cis/het Asian American female, Emily recognizes how her various identity markers have contributed to both her privilege and marginalization within the academy and vis-à-vis her undergraduate and graduate students—many of whom have experienced racial, linguistic, gendered, or social class-based exclusion within education. This awareness shapes her work as Equity, Access, and Inclusion Co-chair for the National

Organization for Student Success. Emily has also co-authored white papers on equity and inclusion in postsecondary education for the College Reading and Learning Association and the National Organization for Student Success. Most recently, Emily analyzed how developmental education scholarship engages with the term *equity* and the implications of our professional language around this topic (Suh “Miles”).

Bethany, a queer, white, working-class woman and first-generation college student, began teaching basic writing in 2014 when she was hired as an adjunct at a multi-campus midwestern community college. Though she holds a PhD in literature and a master’s in history and has no formal education in writing pedagogy, approximately half of her load was teaching basic and first-year writing when she joined the ranks of the full-time faculty in 2015. In 2017, as part of her institution’s shift to largely replacing a traditional developmental writing sequence with a co-requisite model, Bethany began to consciously identify as a teacher of basic writing and saw an urgent need to develop her skills and gain more training to ethically and effectively serve her students. Now, though she primarily teaches courses outside the field, Bethany understands herself to be a developmental educator and believes strongly that this is a role that must be broadly acknowledged as an inherent part of the work done by two-year college instructors. She also believes that faculty have a duty to advocate for equity and justice for students and faculty alike, and due in large part to this conviction, Bethany serves as a founding co-chair of the Two-Year College English Association (TYCA) committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), as TYCA Secretary, and as co-chair and co-founder of her institution’s faculty, staff and student shared governance body.

For both authors, engagement within the field of developmental education is part of an intersectional commitment to antiracist practice and equity and educational justice advocacy that manifests in teaching, in service work, and in scholarship (Suh et al. “Unvoicing”; Suh et al. *Raciolinguistic*; Agyeman and Sweeney; Sweeney and Valenzuela).

METHODOLOGY

Both authors have engaged in significant institutional and professional service and advocacy that have enmeshed us in larger contexts. In this essay, we reflect and build upon these experiences through our application of a social constructivist lens. Specifically, we utilize the tool of critical discourse analysis (Fairclough), which allows us to present exemplary documents that

demonstrate our findings from each of the organizations we discuss in a way that is accessible to as broad an audience as possible.

Given our personal sense of connection to the topic and our close relationship with the texts, we sought to create a rigorous and trustworthy study design. Notably, Emily co-authored the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) White Paper analyzed below. While we might have found another text to represent an in-field professional organization's conceptualization of the relationship between equity and developmental education, we felt that the white paper most clearly articulated how a leading national professional organization took up the work of developmental education. Furthermore, we felt it was important to be able to hold our own scholarship up to the same critical standards by which we analyze other scholars who write about our work and our students. To maximize the trustworthiness of the study, we selected coding protocols which could be easily replicable and were grounded in rigorous methodological and theoretical literature (Fairclough; Swales; Zhang et al.). We also communicated frequently during data analysis, at times coding the documents together, and reviewing all coded segments multiple times.

Data Collection

We collected a representative document from each of four organizations that identify developmental education as a core aspect of their work, including national and local perspectives. The Community College Research Center (CCRC) is an independent, grant-funded research center focused on conducting high-quality research and explicitly espousing a commitment to educational justice.¹ Complete College America (CCA) is a policy-driving organization that has focused on state-level legislative reform through a stated equity lens.² Documents from these organizations present a non-practitioner perspective on developmental education and equity. To capture the practitioner perspective, we selected the most recent white paper from the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA), a leading national organization focused on developmental education, and the strategic plan document from a community college currently undergoing developmental educational and equity reform inspired by the CCRC.³

Data Analysis

We utilized critical discourse analysis in our examination of these documents, focusing on description, interpretation, and explanation of the ways

in which the documents were produced, the ways in which they have been received, and the larger context of higher education and developmental education reform that structures both their form and their content (Fairclough).

In addition, we applied citation content analysis based on John Swales' philosophical assumptions that authors cite scholars whose work they recognize as legitimate (Swales). Using a citation content analysis procedure modified from Zhang et al., we designed an excel spreadsheet and logged each of the 329 mentions of the four documents' combined 190 citations (see Table 1). For each unique mention, we noted the reference, the page

Table 1. Number of Citations by Document

Document	Number of References	Number of Unique Citations
Community College Strategic Plan	0	0
Community College Research Center (Brathwaite and Edgecombe)	13	21
Complete College America	7	11
CRLA White Paper	173	305
Total	193	337

number where the citation occurred, and the type of scholar cited. We identified five types of scholars: Two-Year College Practitioner, Four-Year College Practitioner, Non-Practitioner Researcher, Policy-Organization Associate, and Government Author (see Table 2).

We identified scholar type by author biographies and affiliations as listed in the cited publication. When a citation had multiple authors, we coded each mention once by the first author, unless a subsequent author was a two-year practitioner. This decision was motivated by our desire to acknowledge and amplify the work of two-year college practitioner-scholars whose heavy teaching and service loads leave little time for scholarship and whose job requirements rarely include publication.

Citation analysis findings further facilitated our analysis across the documents.

Table 2. Type of Scholar

Scholar Type	Number of Unique Mentions	Definition	Example
Two-Year College Practitioner	18	Scholar's institutional affiliation is a two-year institution; scholar identifies as holding an instructional role	Jamey Gallagher (2020)
Four-Year College Practitioner (Within Field)	195	Scholar's institutional affiliation is a four-year institution; scholar teaches undergraduate students directly or works with undergraduate students in an administrative position related to student success (i.e., program coordinator)	Jeanine Williams (2021d)
Four-Year College Practitioner (Out-of-Field)	90	Scholar's institutional affiliation is a four-year institution; scholar does not identify as teaching undergraduate students directly or working with undergraduate students in an administrative position related to student success (i.e., program coordinator); scholar may identify with a related field (i.e., Education Studies, K12 Literacy)	Bettina Love (2014)
Four-Year College Non-Practitioner Researcher	18	Scholar does not identify as teaching undergraduate students directly or working with undergraduate students in an administrative position related to student success	Serena Klempin (2014)

(table continues on the next page)

(Table 2 cont.)

Scholar Type	Number of Unique Mentions	Definition	Example
Policy Organization Associate	15	Scholar's affiliation is a policy-driving organization; scholar does not identify as teaching undergraduate students directly or working with undergraduate students in an administrative position related to student success	Complete College America (2014a)
Government Author	5	Scholar's affiliation is with the state or federal government	Clifford Adelman (2006)

PRESENTATIONS OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AND EQUITY

Below we present our critical discourse analysis of paradigmatic texts from four representative organizations' engagement with developmental education and equity. Looking across these texts and contexts, then we explore how each group articulates the connection between developmental education and equity and the perspectives and contexts they privilege in supporting their claims. Notably, we intentionally present the analyzed text's authors as the social actors (grammatical subjects) in our analysis of the documents. This language, while perhaps uncommon in academic prose, illuminates the authors of these texts and emphasizes their contributions to the scholarly conversation about developmental education and equity.

The Research Organization

For more than 25 years, the Community College Research Center (CCRC) has operated through grant funding at Teachers College in Columbia University. The center's research is cited in many efforts to reform or

eliminate developmental education. Indeed, CCRC describes developmental education as “a contributor to equity gaps” and notes “a growing consensus that traditional developmental education is ineffective” (“Why We Study Developmental Education”). On the center’s developmental education webpage, the phrase “contributor to equity gaps” hyperlinks to a 2018 *New Directions for Community Colleges* chapter by CCRC researchers Jessica Brathwaite and Nikki Edgecombe.⁴ Given the article’s prominence, we analyzed it to illuminate CCRC’s position on equity and developmental education.

Despite their stated purpose of “examin[ing] prereform to postreform changes in outcomes across race/ethnicity, gender, and SES” (21), Brathwaite and Edgecombe make only eight direct mentions of (in)equity. These mentions present equity as the goal of developmental education reform but do not explicitly define equity. Instead, the authors’ discussion of equity focuses on their calculations of increasing inequity across multiple measures (i.e., students’ race/ethnicity, SES, gender, and placement level) for an unidentified state’s developmental reform. While the authors base their representation of the connection between developmental education and (in)equity on their own data analysis, their engagement with selected other scholars further illuminates their self-positioning vis-a-vis developmental education literature.

As noted in Table 3, Brathwaite and Edgecombe privileged policy organizations and four-year college non-practitioner researchers through their citation practices. None of the authors’ 21 citations referenced a within-field scholar, as defined above. When combined with the authors’ privileging of their data analysis and lack of a definition of equity (either by the authors or others) as the authors connected developmental education reform and *inequity*, these citation practices emphasized the authors’ disengagement with, if not intentional exclusion of, developmental educator perspectives. These citation choices were unsurprising given that Brathwaite and Edgecombe largely addressed a target audience of policymakers and administrators whom they identified as “developmental reformers” (27).

Table 3. Citation Preferences by Text

Scholar Type (Total Number of Mentions)	Community College Strategic Plan	Community College Research Center (Brathwaite & Edgecombe)	Complete College America	CRLA White Paper
Two-Year College Practitioner (19)	0	0	1	18
Within Field Four-Year College Practitioner (195)	0	0	1	194
Out-of-Field Four-Year College Practitioner (90)	0	1	0	89
Four-Year College Non- Practitioner Researcher (18)	0	9	4	5
Policy Organization Associate (15)	0	8	3	4
Government Author (5)	0	3	2	0
Total of Unique Mentions by Analyzed Text	0	21	11	309*

* Total number of cited scholar types exceeds total of unique mentions by analyzed text due to inclusion of five two-year practitioners who were listed as additional authors

The authors' focus follows a common rhetorical practice in reform-oriented literature of erasing developmental educators from the work of placement, instruction, and reform (Suh et al. "Unvoicing"), such as in their claim,

Reformed assessment and placement systems continue to assign a disproportionate percentage of black and low-SES students to developmental education—perhaps accurately, perhaps not. . . . Being assigned to the lowest levels of developmental education has profoundly negative implications for academic progression and completion. (Brathwaite and Edgecombe 27)

This statement illustrates how the authors' language choices present developmental educators as erased within or replaced by systems. Further, the authors centralize placement, rather than student preparation or developmental support, as the focus of reform. Such a perspective ultimately separates these reform efforts from the very developmental educators responsible for carrying them out. In fact, developmental educators have long raised concerns about how reform, particularly acceleration, may forestall developmental education's own equity agenda of providing individualized wraparound support for students (Armstrong; Hassel et al.; Paulson and Van Overschelde).

In the only statement to directly mentioned developmental educators, the reference is passing. Brathwaite and Edgecombe conclude, "It is essential for practitioners and policymakers to look for disparate impacts by student demographics as even the most well-intended reforms can have unintended consequences" (23). Ultimately, their postreform equity audit addresses developmental education reformers, with the implicit assumption that the vast majority of these reformers are not practitioners themselves. As such, the authors create a false dichotomy between developmental educators and equitable practice. This misrepresentation occurs primarily through the authors' repeated reference to developmental education reform as being driven by equity goals *despite* the inequitable outcomes of such reform. However, the authors' repeated erasure of developmental educators and developmental education scholarship (which goes virtually uncited in the piece) further separates developmental education practitioners from their field's ongoing equity-oriented work. For example, developmental educators have long argued—and continue to argue—that placement measures must

be considered within a comprehensive equity-rooted developmental education reform (Behrman; Good; Hassel et al.; Morante; Nastal et al.; Poe et al.).

The Policy-Driving Organization

As nonpartisan postsecondary advocacy organization (“About Us,” CCA), Complete College America (CCA) is a major policy driver with a long history of critiquing developmental education—and of drawing from CCRC scholarship to do so (CCA *Time, Remediation*). The organization identifies developmental education reform as an equity issue (CCA 2.0). In 2022, CCA and the University of Southern California (USC) Race and Equity Center coauthored *Beyond Good Intentions: Steps to Craft Equity-Driven Policy* (CCA-led) and *Race-Conscious Implementation of a Developmental Education Reform in California Community Colleges* (USC-led). *Beyond Good Intentions* was funded by the Ascendium Education Group, a nonprofit which engages in developmental education reform as equity work (Ascendium). The 20-page report’s coauthorship by a leading scholarly center on educational equity makes it unique from other CCA publications.

Beyond Good Intentions defines equity as “providing individual students the specific resources and services they need so that all students can achieve the same, or equitable, outcomes” (CCA *Beyond* 2). The authors focus on “equity-driven policies” (1), a phrase occurring nine times in the text as well as in the report’s title as the authors offer recommendations to “guide policy development and ensure that all students in your state, particularly those who have been historically excluded, can complete college—and that your state has the educated citizenry it needs to meet workforce and economic goals” (CCA *Beyond* 4). In this context, equity is presented as a neoliberal rationale for developmental education policy reform.

The report repeatedly positions stand-alone prerequisite developmental education courses as the most significant barrier to educational equity. In “Step 3: Craft the Policy,” eliminating prerequisite developmental courses is offered as four of the six provided examples. This recommendation differs from that of many developmental educators who nuance their support for co-requisite instruction by cautioning that replacing all standalone course sequences with co-requisite instruction is an anti-equity policy that forces all students into a one-size-fits-all pathway in which all students must attempt the college-level class regardless of their current skill level (Armstrong; Armstrong et al.; Hassel et al.). The report includes two practitioner references: one advocating wide-scale reform (Hern et al.) and the other a link to

a comprehensive program focused on racial equity (CUNY). Despite these citations in other sections of the report, the authors engage only in self-citation to discuss “Focusing on Equity,” which does not include mention of developmental education—the focus of CCA’s equity work.

Developmental educators themselves are also absent from CCA’s explicit discussion of equity. In the same section on “Focusing on Equity,” the authors note,

At CCA, equity is the focus of everything we do. We envision a nation in which postsecondary institutions, policymakers, and systems of higher education welcome, invest in, and support students through and to on-time completion so that every student—regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or familial educational achievement—has equal opportunity to access and complete a college education or credential of value. (CCA 16)

Developmental educators may be included by defaults within “systems of higher education”; however, the erasure of those who labor to support students is noticeable and concerning. Similarly, in “Step 2: Determining Policy Recommendations,” CCA recommends “Identify[ing] strategies that are proven to work,” including “Go beyond systems and structures to include pedagogical solutions that happen inside the classroom” (9). Through nominalization, this recommendation erases the developmental educators who create and implement the pedagogical solutions to be scaled up—by other developmental education practitioners. This language practice is present in other literature about developmental education reform written by non-developmental educators (Suh et al. “Unvoicing”). When mentioned in the CCA report, developmental educators are presented as passive and un(der) trained (9). Ultimately, the authors’ limited descriptions of developmental educators portray instructors who are familiar with state policy but unable or unwilling to go beyond its good intentions to implement real equity-oriented change; this description supports the report’s larger message to policymakers that developmental educators are not legitimate partners in postsecondary equity.

In developing a sustained partnership with the USC Race and Equity Center, CCA has significantly increased its focus on and commitment to prioritizing equity. Still, CCA is largely dismissive of developmental educators, whom they represent as anti-equity and defenders of developmental courses at the cost of student success. CCA’s report also incorrectly reduces

the comprehensive system of student support that makes up “developmental education” (Armstrong; Boylan) into standalone “remedial” courses (19). This misrepresentation ignores the multiple developmental educator-created models and pedagogies that have paved the way for CCA to erroneously argue that co-requisite instruction is the only equity-minded form of developmental education available (Adams et al.; Jenkins et al.). It is also unfortunately ironic that an argument intended to further equity is based on the inequitable exclusion and intellectual marginalization of practitioners who do the day-to-day work that is being scrutinized (Higgins and Warnke: Toth).

The Professional Organization

When the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) sought to sponsor a white paper about “racial justice literacy” (CRLA May 21, 2021 Meeting Minutes 6), then-President Sonya Armstrong described the board’s sense that such a paper would represent how CRLA members’ professional identities were rooted in equity and developmental education. With this audience in mind, the board commissioned Emily to write the organization’s sixth white paper. Emily invited in coauthors Dr. Jeanine Williams, an influential voice in developmental literacy with a longstanding focus on equity and racial justice, and Sam Owens, coauthor of the National Organization for Student Success white paper responding to critiques of developmental education as anti-equity, and the group outlined their critical examination of language standardization and the role of reading instruction in racial literacy.

The white paper’s authors sought to introduce college literacy and learning professionals to theories and practices “offer[ing] concrete practices to support raciolinguistic justice for racially minoritized members of the academic community” (Suh et al. 2). This purpose was part of the authors’ and CRLA’s larger equity agenda of systemic 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. (4)

The authors also explicated the connection between developmental education, raciolinguistic justice and equity, quoting Armstrong’s CRLA Presidential Address: “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 learners' rights to theoretically sound and evidence-based curriculum developed by expert educators. . . . at this moment, for me, that is at the top of my list of the most important social justice issues" (as cited in Suh et al. 6-7). This citation asserted developmental educators' authority as equity advocates. The authors made 207 unique mentions of in-field developmental education practitioner scholarship, including multiple examples of raciolinguistic justice in postsecondary literacy contexts. These citations typified developmental educators' central role supporting—and leading—equity-minded practices and reforms. This central positioning of developmental educators contrasts markedly from that of CCA and CCRC which vacillate between erasing practitioners' role in reform and equity initiatives and negatively portraying developmental educators as anti-equity. The white paper also included mentions of out-of-field practitioners (situating discussions of equity and raciolinguistic justice within broader scholarship) and policy organizations, evidencing a level of engagement with scholarship not present in any of the other analyzed documents in this study.

The Multicampus Midwestern College

Policy and practitioner organizations often analyze higher education practices like developmental education and equity-based reform, but it is colleges and universities which do the actual work of developing, implementing, and applying such practices. For that reason, we examined how the practices enumerated above translated to a college setting. We selected a large, Midwestern community college spanning urban, suburban, and rural demographics that would offer an informative example of the affordances and limitations extended to equity and developmental education praxis at the institutional level. Based on our significant knowledge of the institution, we identified the selected institution as one engaged in ongoing examination of the institutional approach to both equity and developmental education. In keeping with our broader methodology, we selected for analysis a single college-generated document: "Changing Lives, Empowering Communities: 2023-2028 Strategic Plan." As a publicly available document, the strategic plan intends to both guide the institution and communicate its goals and values to external stakeholders. Despite the stated inclusion of several high-level administrators as stakeholders, the plan included no named authors and failed to list any of the faculty who participating in planning, drafting, or commenting on the document.

Bringing a Folding Chair to the Table

The first sustained mention of equity occurs in the plan's second High Level Initiative: "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" (7). The initiatives were introduced to frame the strategic plan's purpose; despite its prominence, however, equity remains undefined throughout the document. It is referenced as follows:

[The college] will create a diverse and inclusive community committed to leveraging resources to dismantle structural barriers. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) is central to our mission of empowering all communities. [The college] must ensure equitable access and success to serve underrepresented populations. Staff and faculty should reflect the student population, and the campus culture should foster inclusion and belonging. [The college] will respond to the changing demographics of Iowa by expanding support for diverse populations.

While the text might imply that equity involves "leveraging resources to dismantle structural barriers," the college offers no parameters by which to measure equity (or the adjacent terms "inclusion" and "belonging"). Indeed, although Strategic Goal 2 recognizes both that expanded resources are needed for "underrepresented populations" to be able to "be successful" and that the current population of students often does not see itself reflected in the college's employee demographics, the plan offers no benchmarks for defining the goals of representation or success or how they will be achieved. Neither does it explicitly identify the institution's underrepresented populations or the resources needed to serve them. This approach runs counter to equity-oriented developmental education scholarship which advocates for identifying the populations the institution seeks to serve and creating varied and dynamic resources to support students (Armstrong; Boylan, *Targeted*; Hassel et al.; Higgins and Warnke; Poe et al.).

Similarly, the text's explication of key strategies to "provide quality and excellence in all areas across the district" (Strategic Goal 3, n.p.), including "Bolster student enrollment, success, and completion to help students move in and move on" (n.p.) includes language that aligns closely with the field of developmental education (CRLA; CLADEA; NOSS), but there is no evidence that the authors applied a developmental lens to these goals and strategies.

The authors maintain an identical approach in the document's subsequent "Key Strategies for Student Success," the first of which reads, "Through Guided Pathways, advance student success" (6). The authors present Guided

Pathways as a means to “support career exploration and help students gain clarity on their futures, including career planning” (6). Through the section’s four mentions of student “success,” developmental education is completely absent and instead the concept of student success is tied to efficiency and career exploration. This framing is reinforced in four other areas of the plan, including Strategic Goal 4 which describes how “[The college] will educate, support, and provide resources to develop skills and talent for a competitive workforce. To meet this challenge, [the college] will improve its financial stewardship and economic development efforts” (9). Despite strong implicit connections to the field of developmental education, which focuses on student success, developmental courses and student supports are among the details missing from this section and the larger report text which instead emphasizes the institution’s neoliberal focus.

Ultimately, despite indirectly engaging in the broader policy trends related to developmental education discussed above, the “Changing Lives, Empowering Communities” plan never explicitly mentions or addresses developmental education. Instead, however, the influence of policy-driving and research organizations, and in particular CCRC, can be seen in the adoption of Guided Pathways by the college. Indeed, the college launched its shift to the Pathways model hosting a collegewide faculty and staff reading of *Redesigning America’s Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success*, a 2015 book written by three prominent CCRC researchers.

Significantly, “Changing Lives, Empowering Communities” was developed at the same time that the college was undergoing developmental education reform, a process that remains underway as of the writing of this piece. After nearly a decade of departmental conversations about reorganizing developmental education, the college’s English department began implementing a co-requisite model in Fall 2017 (McGregor). Since the advent of the strategic planning process, the college has doubled down in its commitment to the co-requisite model, establishing a Director of Accelerated Placement and a Director of Writing Placement, who have piloted several changes to the English course sequence. In personal communication with Bethany, the Director of Writing Placement indicated strong confidence in the results of the pilot program and the program’s intent to revive the two-semester developmental writing sequence in order to better support the college’s range of student ability (Tisdale). Finally, the revised implementation of the co-requisite model has involved the collection of data on gender, race, age, socioeconomic status, and other factors that will help the college

enact its equity goals of identifying the students being served by the model as well as analyze its effectiveness.

The work being done at the college as pertains to developmental education has some clear positives: English faculty members working on the project are engaged in practitioner research and are committed to providing students with the necessary resources to succeed in college-level English classes. They have also garnered administrative support by dovetailing their practices with the college's high-level initiatives. But notable challenges remain: faculty members who are hired specifically as full-time developmental educators have been sidelined by the college's administration, remaining unassigned to any specific pathway long after other faculty members were moved, and therefore unintentionally excluded from the developmental education reform process or, sometimes, even relevant departmental meetings (Doke-Kerns). The strategic plan does not lay out specific strategies tied to practitioner-based praxis but maintains vague, aspirational language rarely rooted in accountability. Since the college has not fully tied its equity goals to its educational reforms, it has not prioritized increasing outcomes for students of color even though their retention and completion rates are lower than those of white students, and it has not created publicly available measurable targets rooted in robust data.

Perhaps most notably, the college's strategic plan is not rooted in academic scholarship. It does not cite a single researcher, policy organization, developmental education practitioner, faculty member at the college, or even the team of local consultants who guided the process. Instead, it thanks the individual members of groups, all attached to the institution: the Executive Committee, Deans and Provosts, the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Data, and the Board of Trustees. Like the policy organizations who see administrators and policymakers as the authentic developmental education reformers in pursuit of equity, the college's administration sees its leadership as the ones making decisions about equity and access, without the need to acknowledge the voices of the practitioners engaging in the daily work.

Cross-Text Analysis

The intended audience across the analyzed texts included developmental education and equity-minded stakeholders from a range of professional affiliations and positionalities. Despite the stakeholders' and authors' shared interest in equity and developmental education, our analysis illuminated

significant differences between the developmental education practitioner-authored text (CRLA) and other analyzed texts.

First, while the authors' use of the term *equity* implied a shared conceptualization, only two texts (CCA; CRLA) included an explicit definition for this term. Stated and implied definitions suggested that the authors shared an understanding of equity as (1) recognizing diversity of students (implicitly or explicitly linked to racial diversity), their academic strengths and access to resources and (2) providing students with personalized support in order to maximize their opportunity for academic success (see Table 4). However, due to its particular focus, the CRLA White Paper focused on classroom instruction

Table 4. Summary of Findings Across Texts

Organization's Paradigmatic Text	Definition of Equity	Conceptualization of Equity vis-à-vis Developmental Education	Engagement with Within-Field Developmental Education Scholarship
CCRC Journal Article	None provided	Developmental education reform efforts may perpetuate developmental education's existing inequities; developmental educators are erased from conversations of equity work	No mentions of Within-Field Practitioner Scholarship
CCA Funded Report	"Providing individual students the specific resources and services they need so that all students can achieve the same, or equitable, outcomes" (2)	Developmental education is inequitable and must be reformed; developmental educators are erased from conversations of equity work	Limited engagement with scholarship through citation; no mentions of Within-Field Practitioner Scholarship

(table continues on the next page)

(Table 4 cont.)

Organization's Paradigmatic Text	Definition of Equity	Conceptualization of Equity vis-à-vis Developmental Education	Engagement with Within-Field Developmental Education Scholarship
CRLA White Paper on Raciolinguistic Justice	“Teaching the culturally and linguistically diverse students who actually sit with us, not the students others assume are there.... It’s about learners’ rights to theoretically sound and evidence-based curriculum developed by expert educators” (Armstrong as cited in Author et al. 6-7)	Developmental education is an equity practice; developmental educators are experts who create and teach theoretically sound and evidence-based curriculum	Over-representation of practitioner scholarship through citation: 207/309 mentions were of practitioner-scholars with an additional four two-year practitioner-scholars cited as coauthors
DMACC Strategic Plan	None provided; implication that equity involves serving “under-represented populations” (7)	None provided; developmental education is not mentioned in the text despite several references to student success	None provided

while the other three documents used a broader lens (sometimes nebulously so) to discuss equity.

The texts also differed in their representation of the role of developmental education, and particularly developmental educators, in promoting postsecondary equity. In fact, authors’ presentation of developmental education provided the greatest variation between the texts ranging from claims that developmental education is inherently inequitable (CCA) to developmental education is an equity practice (CRLA). Significantly, erasure of developmental educators as engaged in the work of enacting equity and

student success practices was common among all three texts authored by non-developmental education practitioners.

Authors' citation practices followed a similar pattern as there was significantly greater engagement with *Within-Field Developmental Education* scholarship in the CRLA White Paper, including mentions of publications by both two- and four-year practitioners (see Table 3). The CRLA authors also included more mentions of *Out-of-Field Practitioners* although the piece had fewer mentions of *Non-Practitioner Researchers* at the two and four-year levels as well as *Policy Organizations* and *Government-affiliated* authors. While the included documents are not intended to draw definitive conclusions about the citation practices of an entire field or its detractors, we note the significant variation between these particular documents—all of which are purported to address a practitioner audience interested in equity and developmental education. Despite these differences in citation and conceptualization of the relationship between developmental education and equity, common threads existed between the within-field practitioner-scholars and non-practitioner scholars' conceptualizations of equity as specific, individualized support for students.

Across the texts—and the stakeholders they represent—a common definition of equity is a necessary starting point for achieving our shared goal of success for all college students. Our critical discourse analysis illuminates a growing commitment to racial equity amongst stakeholders within professional organizations, policy organizations, and colleges that directly deliver developmental education courses. This increased engagement, research, policy change, and pedagogical emphasis provides significant reason for optimism that equity will continue to occupy a central place in the work that we do.

Nevertheless, challenges remain, foremost among them the fact that many of these conversations continue to occur in relatively isolated contexts and with reliance on assumptions that, when examined closely, often undercut the equity work being championed. As we have demonstrated above, it remains common for policy-driving groups, research organizations, and educational institutions to approach developmental education using a top-down model in which policymakers and college administrators dictate policy (often based on quantitative data) that rarely integrates the qualitative experience of developmental education instructors and students. We highlighted repeated instances in which such actors either erase practitioners or present them as incapable, uninterested in, or hostile to the co-creation

of policy and praxis that would serve our developmental education students effectively, efficiently, and with compassion.

Our analysis uncovers how relative consistency in equity language does not yet ensure that the assumptions and actions behind this language are uniform across policymakers, scholars, administrators, and professional organizations in the field of developmental education. Further, our findings foreshadow graver concerns than incongruence of language: within a context in which equity is under direct political attack and in which administrators and policymakers seek to develop accommodationist strategies to avoid political attention or anticipated financial challenges such as cuts to state funding, it is clear that equity is under siege on multiple fronts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Below, we offer recommendations for practitioners and policy analysts engaging in practices that promote genuine equity across the field of developmental education. There are no easy answers here. Instead, there are guidelines for commitments and actions that we believe will lead to the advancement of equity work. Above all, we offer an alternative set of priorities and a framing structure that we believe will be more effective and more ethical than the ones highlighted in our analysis above.

Recommendations for Scholarship

Although we intentionally write to a practitioner-oriented audience, we recognize our readers' engagement in scholarship and begin by noting how our findings further illustrate massive inequity in citation: if publications were genuinely committed to being inclusive of all voices, they would include more practitioner and practitioner-scholar voices. As noted in the College Conference on Composition and Communication (CCCC)'s "Position Statement on Citation Justice in Rhetoric, Composition, and Writing Studies," "Citation is about giving credit to those whose thinking has informed and preceded our own. It is also how disciplines determine epistemological legitimacy. It is thus crucial that we attend to the politics and social justice implications of citation." When developmental educators are not cited in scholarship on developmental education reform, their epistemological and practical contributions to equity work in the field are marginalized and erased. Therefore, it is essential that reformers, researchers, and policymakers engage in concerted effort and sustained commitment to

citational justice that includes such producers of knowledge as substantive voices in this work.

Recommendations to Actively Engage in, with, and for the Field

Although we sometimes reference practitioners in this piece with an insistent optimism that sees them as sharing in the overall set of values that drives our own work, we also recognize the long list of scholar-practitioners who have previously called for the need for increased engagement among Writing Studies professionals, particularly from the two-year college or other open access contexts (Andelora; Sullivan). For example, Toth and Sullivan concluded that the Teacher-Scholar model of two-year teaching is “more aspirational than descriptive of the majority of two-year college English faculty” (250). Four years later, Suh and Jensen reported similar findings among basic writing instructors across postsecondary institutional contexts. In response to the significant pressures facing many aspiring two-year college teacher-scholar-activists, Cheri Lemieux Spiegel advocates for embracing a “revolution-ish approach,” which she describes as affording flexibility, aspiring to a culture of innovation rather than fixating on a single battle, and a gentleness towards self to recognize when “to press pause on my tactics and await the next right moment” (11). In his invitation to two-year English faculty to engage as developmental education teacher-scholar-activists, Sullivan encourages practitioners to (1) recognize their ability to contribute, (2) focus on little actions that can create compounding impacts, and (3) engage in the work of both enacting equitable practices and also communicating with other stakeholders about the value of our contributions (Suh et al., “Teacher”). Sullivan and Lemieux Spiegel remind us of the importance of our engagement with our profession and field in order to serve our students, and we call on our peers to prioritize this aspiration.

Recommendations for Accounting for Labor in Scholarly Production

The citational injustice discussed previously is magnified by the lack of equity that scholars face when engaging in the labor of research and publication. Therefore, an explicit effort must be made to value the labor that goes into scholarship and to consider whether such labor is valued by a scholar’s institution. As many readers are well aware, the amount of labor required to produce a scholarly work is significant, particularly when such scholarship draws not only upon the literature but also upon classroom

experiences or observations, engagements with students, and interactions with colleagues. These lived experiences can nuance the writing of practitioner-scholars in impactful ways, and scholars should work to amplify the voices and expertise of practitioner-scholars who engage in publication on top of heavy teaching loads and in institutional contexts where scholarly productivity is not a measure for tenure or promotion (Klausman et al., see Toth's volume on transfer for an example of how a four-year scholar actively sought to amplify and engage with two-year scholar-practitioner perspectives in both scholarship and practice). Given the conditions under which many practitioner-scholars engage in scholarship, the erasure or silencing of their perspectives is especially problematic, yet much of their work has been undervalued and sometimes outright ignored in texts by non-practitioner researchers or policy-driving organizations (Suh et al. "Unvoicing"). Bethany has direct experience with practitioner silencing and erasure: like the other faculty who participated in strategic plan retreats, she was unnamed in her college's final strategic plan document and her academic presentations at conferences and her publications are not considered by her institution as necessary or as even meaningfully contributing to her faculty role.

Recommendations for Prioritizing Antiracism in Equity Work

Across the analyzed texts, equity was explicitly and implicitly connected to race. Indeed, fundamental to the concept of equity is the understanding that people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds face disparities in access to privilege, to resources, to opportunities, and ultimately to outcomes (USC Race and Equity Center). Two of the field's largest professional organizations, CRLA and NOSS, have explicated the connection between racial equity and developmental education (Armstrong, personal communication; Suh et al. *Clarifying*; Suh et al. *Raciolinguistic Justice*). Through white papers, official statements, and conference themes and strands among other professional development opportunities, these organizations have worked to foreground the role of developmental educators in promoting racial justice. In order for developmental educators to work with other student success stakeholders, it is essential that we unite behind a common understanding of our work as advancing racial equity.

However, antiracism cannot fall into the trap of prioritizing virtue signaling or performativity over authentic and holistic advocacy for equity. In some cases, this happens when organizations make vague references to increased outcomes for students across racial groups or when they use terms

like “inclusion,” “belonging,” or even “equity” without providing a clear definition (“Changing Lives, Empowering Communities”).

Being intentionally antiracist means spending time doing the actual work and not focusing our energies on merely signaling that we are doing the work. That sometimes means compromising, accepting less-than-perfect solutions, and accepting that incremental change, while never the ultimate goal, can be a viable strategy along the way. After all, “if we want a world with less suffering and more flourishing, it would be useful to perceive complexity and complicity as the constitutive situation of our lives, rather than as things we should avoid” (Shotwell). Equity work is often messy and imperfect, and that’s something we need to commit to embracing.

This means that we need to work intersectionally and sometimes even across ideological lines. There are a lot of challenges facing our students and our colleagues. They all matter, and they all tie back into core systems of oppression. As developmental educators, we see how these intersecting oppressions daily impact the lives of our students. However, we also see evidence of collaboration and reason for hope. On our own campuses, we intentionally seek to collaborate with food pantries, free clinics, and community resource groups that honor the humanity of our students and their full lives outside of our classrooms. We also partner with faculty who do not identify as developmental educators. Emily, for example, is collaborating with biology faculty and success staff to support students who are blocked from taking the entry-level course until they have completed their developmental coursework. Bethany is actively working to promote college policies that lower course material costs and expand access to support services that aim to lessen the impact of non-academic barriers for students.

As important as doing the day-to-day equity work of practitioners is, we believe that we all also have a duty to engage with the research and policy being created by reformers and policy groups. This is a challenging task because many developmental educators are spread impossibly thin. However, if we want to build a strong voice in developmental education reform conversations, we need to both ensure that we keep our intersectional, coalitional approach by prioritizing working with multiple groups, stakeholders, community partners, etc., and ensure that we are pressing for a place at the table with the groups that don’t proactively include us.

To make this sustainable, we need to commit to devoting our full focus to one or two areas, but also to doing the work of lifting up other voices and other work as we focus on centering our own priorities, prioritizing collaboration and cooperation over competition. This means that we may need to

strategically alter our language at times. We may need to use the arguments that we know will convince our audience, even when the arguments that best reflect our own views are different. But we should never accept conditions that require equity to be sidelined or put on the back burner.

Always, working for equity means insisting on claiming our space and our right to be a part of the conversation and of the decision-making process. It is this principle that guided our decision to draw from Chisholm's legacy. After serving four years in the New York state legislature, Chisholm ran for the U.S House of Representatives without support from party leadership—and won. During her time in Washington, D.C., Congresswoman Chisholm introduced over 50 pieces of legislation to support people of color, immigrants, working class individuals, and women and children (Bring Your Own Chair). Chisholm's encouragement to "bring a folding chair to the table" calls upon us to provide insistent presence, even when—especially when—it makes people uncomfortable. As Chisholm's political career can attest, it is a strategy that works, and one we believe needs to be given a more prominent place in higher ed advocacy.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately, we believe that if we rectify the inequity with which various stakeholders in this conversation have been positioned by removing existing deficit framings of developmental education, we can bring all parties to the table to develop a unified equity-minded practice. Our field has the potential to both thrive in its own right and to advance the cause of equity and belonging more broadly across postsecondary education for policymakers, faculty, and students alike. This kind of work has never been more critical: given the current political demonization of educators of all kinds at the national, state, and local levels, it is essential that we join forces to build meaningful equity and justice within our profession and for the students we serve.

NOTES

1. According to the "About Us" page on the CCRC website, the organization exists "to help community colleges enrich the lives of every student who passes through their doors. . . to promote a more just higher education system and a more just society."
2. In their About Us page, the organization states, "We believe higher education has a choice: to continue to reflect the racial, social, and economic injustice in society—or reimagine our systems to be engines

of equity, prosperity, and hope,” and they enact this vision by scaling structural reforms and promoting policy changes.

3. Although we view these first two organizations as professional organizational homes for developmental education at the national level, we note that only CRLA explicitly names its ongoing commitment to developmental education, listing “Reading, Learning Assistance, Developmental Education, Tutoring, Mentoring” as its foci at the top of its webpage (CRLA). In contrast, we surmise NOSS’ continued interest in developmental education based upon its previous name and engagement with Developmental Education, Developmental English/Literacy, and Developmental Mathematics (as evidenced by 2023 conference session titles and descriptions).
4. *New Directions for Community Colleges* is a quarterly, peer-reviewed journal of “evidence-based and research-oriented accounts that shape policy and practice” in community college education (New Directions). Articles often limit methodological and statistical findings discussions in favor of implications relevant to community college administrators and faculty leaders.

Works Cited

- “About.” *New Directions for Community Colleges*. onlinelibrary.wiley.com/page/journal/15360733/homepage/productinformation.html.
- “About Us.” Ascendium, ascendiumphilanthropy.org/about-us.
- “About Us.” College Reading and Learning Association, 2018, crla.net/index.php.
- “About Us.” Community College Research Center, ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/about-us.html.
- “About Us.” USC Race and Equity Center, Dec. 2023, race.usc.edu/about-us.
- Adams, Peter, Sarah Gearhart, Robert Miller, and Anne Roberts. “The Accelerated Learning Program: Throwing Open the Gates.” *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2009, pp. 50-69. doi.org/10.37514/jbw-j.2009.28.2.04.
- Agyeman, Ahmed, and Bethany Sweeney. “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at Des Moines Area Community College: Lessons from our Comprehensive Culture Audit.” National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education Conference, 10 Mar. 2021, Virtual.
- Akin, Katie. “Iowa Bans ‘Divisive Concepts’ from Diversity Trainings, School Curriculum.” Iowa Capital Dispatch, 8 June 2021, iowacapitaldispatch.com.

- com/2021/06/08/iowa-bans-divisive-concepts-from-diversity-trainings-school-curriculum.
- Andelora, Jeff. "Forging a National Identity: TYCA and the Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 35, no. 4, May 2008, pp. 350-62. doi.org/10.58680/tetyc20086554.
- Armstrong, Sonya L. "What's Been Keeping Me Awake at Night: The Future (?) of 'The Field.'" *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, vol. 50, no. 2, Apr. 2020, pp. 56-69. doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2020.1750849.
- Armstrong, Sonya L., Britt A. Posey, and Pamela J. Mahan. "Purposeful Coreq'ing with Curriculum Crosswalks." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 48, no. 4, May 2021, pp. 436-46. doi.org/10.58680/tetyc202131351.
- Ayers, Vivian. "Diversity, Equity, Inclusion: Proposed Texas Bill Seeks to Increase 'Viewpoint Diversity' in Higher Education." *The Daily Texan*, 26 Jan. 2023, thedailytexan.com/2023/01/26/diversity-equity-inclusion-proposed-texas-bill-seeks-to-increase-viewpoint-diversity-in-higher-education.
- Bailey, Thomas, Dong Wook Jeong, and Sung-Woo Cho. "Referral, Enrollment, and Completion in Developmental Education Sequences in Community Colleges." *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 29, no. 2, Apr. 2010, pp. 255-70. doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.09.002.
- Bailey, Thomas R., Shanna Smith Jaggars, and Davis Jenkins. *Redesigning America's Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success*. Harvard UP, 2015.
- Boylan, Hunter R. "Targeted Intervention for Developmental Education Students (T.I.D.E.S.)." *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 32, no. 3, Spring 2009, pp. 14-18, 20, 22-23. eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ868669.
- . "Harvard Symposium 2000: Developmental Education: Demographics, Outcomes, and Activities." *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 23, no. 2, Winter 1999, pp. 2-8. eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ597639.
- Behrman, Edward H. "Developmental Placement Decisions: Content-Specific Reading Assessment." *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 23, no. 3, Spring 2000, pp. 12-18. eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ602060.
- Brathwaite, Jessica, and Nikki Edgecomb. "Developmental Education Reform Outcomes by Subpopulation." *New Directions in Community College*, vol. 2018, no. 182, Apr. 2018, pp. 21-29. doi.org/10.1002/cc.20298.
- Calcagno, Juan Carlos, and Bridget Terry Long. *The Impact of Postsecondary Remediation Using a Regression Discontinuity Approach: Addressing Endog-*

- enous Sorting and Noncompliance*. Working Paper 14194, National Bureau of Economic Research, July 2008. doi.org/10.3386/w14194.
- “Changing Lives, Empowering Communities: Strategic Plan 2023-2028.” Des Moines Area Community College, dmacc.edu/institutional-effectiveness/documents/strategicplan2024-28.pdf.
- Christensen, Laurene, Renata Fitzpatrick, Robin Murie, and Xu Zhang. “Building Voice and Developing Academic Literacy for Multilingual Students: The Commanding English Model.” *The General College Vision: Integrating Intellectual Growth, Multicultural Perspectives, and Student Development*, edited by Jeanne L. Higbee, Dana B. Lundell, and David R. Arendale, University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, 2005, pp. 155-84.
- Clark, Romy, and Roz Ivanic, editors. *Critical Language Awareness*. Multilingual Matters Limited, 1999.
- College Reading and Learning Association. “May 21, 2021 Meeting Minutes.” 2021, crla.net/index.php/board-of-directors-meeting-minutes.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Routledge, 2000.
- Complete College America. “About.” 2020, completecollege.org/about.
- . “Complete College America Strengthens Board with Four New Members.” Complete College America, 10 Feb. 2020, completecollege.org/resource/complete-college-america-strengthens-board-with-four-new-members.
- . “Corequisite Remediation: Spanning the Completion Divide.” 2023, completecollege.org/spanningthedivide.
- . “New Rules: Policies to Meet Attainment Goals and Close Equity Gaps, Version 2.0.” Nov. 2017, eric.ed.gov/?id=ED594287.
- . “New Rules: Policies to Strengthen and Scale the Game Changers.” Nov. 2016. eric.ed.gov/?id=ED595082.
- . “Our Vision.” completecollege.org/about-us/.
- . “Promise with a Purpose: College Promise Programs Built for Completion.” 2018. eric.ed.gov/?id=ED583644.
- . “Purpose First.” completecollege.org/purposefirst.
- . “Remediation: Higher Education’s Bridge to Nowhere.” Apr. 2012. eric.ed.gov/?id=ED536825.
- . “Strategic Plan.” 2019, completecollege.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/CCA_3-Yr-Strategic-Plan_2019_one-pager.pdf.
- . “Time Is the Enemy: The Surprising Truth About Why Today’s College Students Aren’t Graduating. . . And What Needs to Change.” Sept. 2011. eric.ed.gov/?id=ED536827.

- . "Why We Exist." completecollege.org/about-us.
- Complete College Georgia. "About CCG." 2019, completegeorgia.org/content/about-ccg.
- Doke-Kerns, Jennifer. Verbal communication with Author 2. 4 Jan. 2024.
- Etikan, Ilker, Sulaiman Abubakar Musa, and Rukayya Sunusi Alkassim. "Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling." *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, vol. 5, no. 1, Jan. 2016, pp. 1-4. doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11.
- "Executive Order on Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping." *Trump White House*, 2020, trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-combating-race-sex-stereotyping.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Study of Language (2nd Edition)*. Routledge, 2013.
- "Florida Bill Would Destroy Higher Education as We Know It." *American Association of University Professors*, 27 Feb. 2023, aaup.org/news/florida-bill-would-destroy-higher-education-we-know-it#.ZCHBQezMJUc.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin, 1972.
- Good, Jennifer M. "Evaluating Developmental Education Programs by Measuring Literacy Growth." *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 24, no. 1, Fall 2000, pp. 30-8. eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ613490.
- Grubb, W. Norton, Norena Badway, and Denise Bell. "Community Colleges and the Equity Agenda: The Potential of Noncredit Education." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 586, no. 1, Mar. 2023, pp. 218-40. doi.org/10.1177/0002716202250226.
- "HB 999/SB 266: Higher Education Censorship and Government Control Bill." American Civil Liberties Union, 2023, aclufl.org/en/legislation/hb-999sb-266-higher-education-censorship-and-government-control-bill.
- Hassel, Holly, Jeffrey Klausman, Joanne Baird Giordano, Margaret O'Rourke, Leslie Roberts, Patrick Sullivan, and Christie Toth. "TYCA White Paper on Developmental Education Reforms." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 43, no. 3, Mar. 2015, pp. 227-43.
- Hern, Katie, Myra Snell, and Leslie Henson. "Still Getting There: How California's AB 705 is (and is Not) Transforming Remediation and What Needs to Come Next." California Acceleration Project, 2020, accelerationproject.org/wp-content/uploads/documents/Still_Getting_There_Final.pdf.
- Higgins, Kristen, and Anthony Warnke. "Guided Pathways as Diverging Interest for the Two-Year College." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 51, no. 2, Dec. 2023, pp. 107-21. doi.org/10.58680/tetyc2023512107.

- Inoue, Asao B. "Teaching Antiracist Reading." *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, vol. 50, no. 3, July 2020, pp. 134-56. doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2020.1787079.
- Janks, Hilary. "Critical Literacy in Teaching and Research." *Education Inquiry*, vol. 4, no. 2, June 2013, pp. 225-42. doi.org/10.3402/edui.v4i2.22071.
- Jenkins, Davis, Clive Belfield, Cecilia Speroni, Shanna Smith Jaggars, and Nikki Edgecombe. "A Model for Accelerating Academic Success of Community College Remedial English Students: Is the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) Effective and Affordable? CCRC Working Paper No. 21." Community College Research Center, Columbia University, 2010, ccrctc.columbia.edu/publications/accelerating-academic-success-remedial-english.html.
- Kendi, Ibram X. *How to Be an Antiracist*. One World, 2019.
- Klausman, Jeffrey, Holly Hassel, Joanne Baird Giordano, Patrick Sullivan, Lizbett Tinoco, and McKenna Wegner. "TYCA Working Paper #8: Making the Material Realities of Two-Year College English Labor Visible." TYCA Workload Task Force, Nov. 2020.
- McGee, Barrie S., Jeanine L. Williams, Sonya L. Armstrong, and Jodi P. Holschuh. "Gateways, Not Gatekeepers: Reclaiming the Narrative for Developmental Education." *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 44, no. 2, Winter 2021, pp. 2-10. eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1320571.
- McGregor, Shannon. Text communication with Author 2. 13 Apr. 2023.
- McNair, Tia Brown, Susan Albertine, Nicole McDonald, Thomas Major, Jr., and Michelle Asha Cooper. *Becoming a Student-Ready College: A New Culture of Leadership for Student Success*. John Wiley & Sons, 2022.
- Menchaca, Megan. "Texas Senate Bill Would Ban DEI Offices, Statements at Public Colleges, Universities." *Austin American Statesman*, 11 Mar. 2023, statesman.com/story/news/education/2023/03/11/texas-legislature-senate-bill-17-ban-dei-offices-statements-violators/69997111007.
- Morante, Edward A. "Selecting Tests and Placing Students." *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 13, no. 2, Winter 1989, pp. 2-4, 6. eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ399499.
- Nastal, Jessica, Mya Poe, and Christie Toth, eds. *Writing Placement in Two-Year Colleges: The Pursuit of Equity in Postsecondary Education*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2022.
- Paulson, Eric J., and James P. Van Overschelde. "Accelerated Integrated Reading and Writing: A Statewide Natural Experiment." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, vol. 45, no. 1, 2021, pp. 13-30. doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2019.1636733.

- "Position Statement on Citation Justice in Rhetoric, Composition, and Writing Studies." Conference on College Composition and Communication, Nov. 2022, cccc.ncte.org/cccc/citation-justice.
- Rosa, Jonathan, and Nelson Flores. "Unsettling Race and Language: Toward a Raciolinguistic Perspective." *Language in Society*, vol. 46, no. 5, Nov. 2017, pp. 621-64. doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562.
- Shapiro, Shawna. *Cultivating Critical Language Awareness in the Writing Classroom*. Routledge, 2022.
- Shotwell, Alexis. *Against Purity: Living Ethically in Compromised Times*. U of Minnesota P, 2016.
- Spiegel, Cheri Lemieux. "Viva la Revolución-ish: The Teacher-Scholar-Activist as Guerilla." *Basic Writing e-Journal*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2020, pp. 1-33.
- Spindleman, Marc. "Sunsetting Racial Justice in the Sunshine State and Florida-izing the Nation: How Florida's Anti-Diversity Legislation May Be a Model for the Supreme Court." *The American Prospect*, 10 Mar. 2023, prospect.org/justice/2023-03-10-race-legislation-florida-supreme-court.
- Suh, Emily K. "Miles to Go Before We Sleep: A Two-Part Content Analysis of Representations of Equity in the Dev Ed'r Discourse Community." *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, vol. 52, no. 4, Oct. 2022, pp. 236-63.
- Suh, Emily, and Darin Jensen. "Examining Communities of Practice." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2020, pp. 33-59. doi.org/10.37514/jbw-j.2020.39.2.03.
- Suh, Emily K., Jeanine L. Williams, and Sam Owens. "Raciolinguistic Justice in College Literacy and Learning: A Call for Reflexive Praxis." Whitepaper, College Reading and Learning Association, Dec. 2021.
- Suh, Emily K., Na Wu, Candice Oelschegel, Agustín García, and Sonya Armstrong. "Unvoicing a Field's Expertise: A Two-Pronged Citation and Language Analysis." *Journal of Praxis in Higher Education*, vol. 4, no. 2, July 2022, pp. 90-121. doi.org/10.47989/kpdc280.
- Suh, Emily K., Patrick Sullivan, Barrie McGee, and Sam Owens. "Feature: Developmental Education and the Teacher-Scholar-Activist: An Invitation." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 49, no. 4, May 2022, pp. 325-52.
- Suh, Emily K., Sam Owens, Ekateryna O'meara, and Leanna Hall. "Clarifying Terms and Reestablishing Ourselves within Justice: A Response to Critiques of Developmental Education as Anti-Equity." Whitepaper, National Organization for Student Success, 2021.
- Sullivan, Patrick. "The Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar-Activist." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 42, no. 4, May 2015, pp. 327-50.

- Stake, Robert E. *The Art of Case Study Research*. Sage Publications, 1995.
- Swales, John. "Citation Analysis and Discourse Analysis." *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1986, pp. 39-56.
- Sweeney, Bethany, and Rosalinda Valenzuela. "DEI Accomplishments and Challenges at Two-Year Colleges." Two-Year College English Association—Southwest, 14 Oct 2022, Oklahoma City, OK.
- Texas State Legislature, Senate. *An Act Relating to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives at Public Institutions of Higher Education*, SB 17. Texas Legislature Online, 2023, capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/88R/billtext/pdf/SB000171.pdf.
- Tisdale, Heather. Verbal Communication with Author 2. 14 Apr. 2023.
- Trinidad, Adrián. "Race-Conscious Implementation of a Developmental Education Reform in California Community Colleges." USC Race and Equity Center and Complete College America, Aug. 2022, static1.square-space.com/static/62c4ba2609f6370427726636/t/62fe64db8ebc062b8849066b/1660839144441/Report+1+AB+705-spreads+%281%29.pdf.
- Toth, Christie. *Transfer in an Urban Writing Ecology: Reimagining Community College-University Relations in Composition Studies*. NCTE, Studies in Writing and Rhetoric Series, no. 74, 2023.
- Toth, Christie, and Patrick Sullivan. "Toward Local Teacher-Scholar Communities of Practice: Findings from a National TYCA Survey." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 43, no. 3, Mar. 2016, pp. 247-73. doi.org/10.58680/tetyc201628376.
- Wilson, Steve. "Explorations of the Usefulness of Case Study Evaluations." *Evaluation Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 3, Aug. 1979, pp. 446-59. doi.org/10.1177/0193841x7900300307.
- Zhang, Guo, Ying Ding, and Staša Milojević. "Citation Content Analysis (CCA): A Framework for Syntactic and Semantic Analysis of Citation Content." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, vol. 64, no. 7, 2013, pp. 1490-1503. doi.org/10.1002/asi.22850.