From the Editors

We are happy to report that the number and quality of the articles being submitted to the journal is continuing to rise. In response to this development, we have added four new members to the WPA editorial board who bring expertise in a variety of areas, but are especially skilled in reading more quantitative research studies of the kind that members are conducting and reporting. We welcome Norbert Elliott, Patricia Ericsson, Asao Inoue, and Scott Warnock to the group. These editorial board members, along with those already in the group, provide thorough and thoughtful reviews of the articles we judge to warrant outside readings.

We have added two new features in this issue. First, we have created a space called “WPAs in Dialogue,” in which readers can respond to anything that appears in the journal. For this issue, Linda Adler-Kassner has taken up some points raised by Keith Rhodes in “You Are What You Sell” from the Spring issue. And Keith Rhodes offers a response.

With the other new feature, we bring you two items from the organization. First, we are fortunate to have Joe Janangelo’s plenary address from the summer WPA conference in Philadelphia. If you were not able to attend the meeting, this printed version of Joe’s talk is one opportunity to see some of what you missed. Next year, we will hope to get all the plenary addresses to publish in the journal. Second, we are publishing the results of last year’s survey on mentoring. The findings of the survey were discussed by the Executive Board and shaped the conference this summer, but since not everyone is aware of the results, publication of this important study seemed appropriate to us. The survey’s introduction provides the varied perspectives of those who conducted it: Joe Janangelo, Sheldon Walcher and Duane Roen. Their careful presentation of the findings, both positive and negative, provides much food for thought for every member of WPA. We hope you will read it carefully (along with everything else in this issue, of course) and respond in the new “Dialogue” section if you are so inclined.

Looking ahead, in the Spring issue, we will offer a travelogue for Baton Rouge and Louisiana so that members will go to next summer’s WPA con-
ference well informed about pertinent issues in the area where we will be meeting.

In this issue

Chris Gallagher’s “Assess Locally, Validate Globally: Heuristics for Validating Local Writing Assessments” offers a heuristic for reviewing assessment quality and for developing “validation arguments framed within the principles and terms that the field and individual programs value.”

Cynthia Haller’s “Toward Rhetorical Source Use: Three Student Journeys” provides a careful analysis of how three students read and integrate source materials in their research papers. This close qualitative study contains useful insights about students’ reading and their implications for the teaching of writing that will be instructive for WPA readers.

In “Undaunted, Self-Critical, and Resentful: Investigating Faculty Attitudes Toward Teaching Writing in a Large University Writing-Intensive Course Program,” Lori Salem and Peter Jones report on a qualitative study of faculty attitudes towards teaching writing intensive courses in the disciplines. Although their work was done at a large, urban institution, their findings may be useful to WPAs working in many other situations.

Our WPAs in Dialogue forum affords Linda Adler-Kassner an opportunity to articulate compelling differences between the activist agenda she theorizes within her book, *The Activist WPA*, and Keith Rhodes’s call for a strategic and responsible organizational branding of CWPA Composition. His reply clarifies his sense of the common ground between the two visions.

In the printed text of Janangelo’s plenary, he invites us to think carefully about how we approach our WPA work. He asks: “How can we chase and cultivate unlimited WPA work? One way is to look within and beyond celebrated ideas to see if they have become sedimented ideations. Another way is to hold suspect—rather than dear—our philosophic and pragmatic inheritances.” He proposes other approaches that warrant much further thought.

The Mentoring Survey report comes to us from Joe Janangelo, Sheldon Walcher and Duane Roen. In their introduction, each of them explains his interest in the project and his role in the work that was done. The report itself follows the introduction and concludes with a detailed discussion of some initiatives from the study that have already been adopted by the CWPA Executive Board. All members of this organization will learn a great deal from reading the findings in this report.

For our fall / winter WPA Symposium, we invited WPAs who have earned excellence in teaching awards to engage the issue of teacher quality
in the teaching of writing. Larry Beason, Beth Brunk-Chavez, Clyde Moneyhun and Diana Ashe offer both their best sense of the issue and strategies for determining teacher quality.

Reviews

Lorelei Blackburn and Ellen Cushman’s book review essay considers new and pivotal books by community literacy scholars and examines the rightful location of writing programs, the landscape of institutional change, and the situatedness of writing programs within universities and local communities.

In his review essay, “As Writing Professionalizes, Asking What, How, and Why,” Douglas Hesse examines the professionalizing and administrative turn of composition through the lens of six recent texts. Hesse’s review encourages us to ponder whether we are privileging our “identities as administrators over those as teachers and scholars.”

In her review essay, “Conflicted Brokers: The Local, Historical, and Political of Basic writing,” Kelly Ritter discusses three books concerning the present and future direction of basic writing instruction at the college level. Based on her analysis, she calls for a field-wide reconsideration of the current configuration of “basic writing” based on the impact of local, historical, and political contexts have on individual basic writing programs.