Table 1: Canonical and Antiracist Social Actions of the Classroom Genre System

Textual artifact	Canonical components and antiracist extensions	Canonical Social Actions of the Cl	Antiracist Social Action
Syllabus	<ul> <li>Course description</li> <li>Faculty contact info.</li> <li>Required texts</li> <li>Attendance</li> <li>Lateness policies</li> <li>Assignment descriptions</li> <li>Grading policy</li> <li>Course schedule</li> </ul> Commitment statement	Attunement of writer to the writing classroom as an authoritative space, situated within colonial structures and limiting notions of knowledge and "appropriate" writing.	Reexamines course goals and instructor teaching pedagogies with a mind toward cultivating a series of commitments to students, linguistic justice, and safety.
Assignment Sheet	<ul> <li>Community agreement</li> <li>Timeline</li> <li>Description</li> <li>Learning goals</li> <li>Grading Expectations</li> <li>Flexible word/page counts</li> <li>Composing process descriptions</li> <li>Dialogic evaluation and revision</li> </ul>	Attunement of writer to writing genres explored in the course, standards for evaluation and un/success, and expectations for writing performance.  Disrupts critical pedagogies, in particular students' relearning of writing as a process, rather than as a series of products.	Recenters writing assignments as an ongoing, expanding process of knowledge-building through interconnected assignments and references to course concepts and student discussions. Treats assignment sheets as complementary conversations to and spaces of experimentation with course ideas.
Rubrics	<ul> <li>Specifies traits of assignment that will be assessed</li> <li>Identifies performance categories for each trait</li> <li>Capacious traits</li> <li>Asset-based performance descriptions</li> <li>Co-constructed</li> </ul>	Attunement of writer to the textual performance described in the assignment sheet through a seemingly objective tool.	Challenges the invisible ideology of academic writing by demonstrating the capaciousness of writing constructs, placing writer agency at all levels of performance, and shifts the power of who gets to decide what is evaluated.
Teacher Feedback	<ul> <li>Addressed to writer</li> <li>Begins positive</li> <li>Offers criticism</li> <li>Suggests next steps</li> </ul> Accessible technology <ul> <li>Embodiment</li> </ul>	Attunement of writer to the textual performance described in the assignment sheet through the textualized "voice" of instructor authority	Shifts the embodiment of feedback to oral and multimodal performances that allow for dialogue, physical safety, and negotiation.
Peer Review Sheets	<ul> <li>Guiding questions for review</li> <li>Additional reader questions for author</li> <li>Author statement</li> <li>Author review</li> </ul>	Works to attune writers to the textual performance described in the assignment sheet through teacher authority (guiding questions) and reader awareness (questions for author)—i.e., additional questions that remain unresolved by the guiding questions.	Author statements lead with the student's goals for a writing task. Those are positioned with the guiding questions.  Author reviews allow students to assess peer review and encourage additional viewpoints.  Authors choose the kind of response they need at a particular moment and with a particular reader.
Self- assessment	<ul> <li>Task that points student to reflect on their process or a set of defined elements related to a learning outcome.</li> <li>Guided prompt connected to the learning goals for the assignment</li> <li>Positionality statement</li> </ul>	Invites author reflection on their goals, processes, products, and extensions (forward and backward) of the writing task and resulting learning.	Creates trustworthiness. Reflection is not soulsearching.  Positionality in relation to a project allows students to surface pieces of their identity that shape what they see and write. Break from objective notions of knowledge-making.