Dear Reviewer:

Thank you for agreeing to review a manuscript for *WPA: Writing Program Administration*. The journal would not exist without your work. We appreciate it greatly.

Prior to beginning your review, we ask that you read the following document, which is available by clicking the link included in the citation. Please pay particular attention to Section 5, as several questions in the review form relate directly to the recommendations in that section.

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

The review form below includes two parts, both of which will be shared with the author(s) of the manuscript you have agreed to review:

Part one asks for your overall ratings in several areas.

Part two is the more substantive part of the review. We find that specific, detailed reviews are most helpful to the authors, particularly for pieces that need significant revision. Many reviewers choose to address the authors directly (either in a note or letter), and we find this strategy to be beneficial.

In all aspects of your feedback, please be attentive to the language, examples, and sources you use and ensure that your comments are framed to support author revisions, even if your ultimate recommendation is that the submission is not a good fit for publication in the journal.

When your review is complete, please submit it to us at wpaeditors@gmail.com. Please return the review form as a .doc or .docx file. Again, thank you for doing this important work. We appreciate your service to the journal.

Sincerely,

Tracy Ann Morse
Patti Poblete
Wendy Sharer

Manuscript Title:

Reviewer Name and Preferred Pronouns:

Part One: Overall Ratings

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements by placing an X next to the appropriate choice. Responses will be shared with the author(s) of the manuscript.

1. The manuscript addresses an important current issue, challenge, or opportunity in the field of writing program administration.
   __Strongly Agree
   __Agree
   __Disagree
   __Strongly Disagree

2. The manuscript meaningfully engages relevant perspectives and scholarship from diverse authors, including BIPOC, multiply-marginalized (gender, race, disability, sexual identity, etc.) and underrepresented scholars.
   __Strongly Agree
   __Agree
   __Disagree
   __Strongly Disagree

3. The manuscript goes beyond mere local reporting ("here's what I did" or "here's the way we do things here.") If local reports are given, their connection to theory, history, research, or practice are made evident.
   __Strongly Agree
   __Agree
   __Disagree
   __Strongly Disagree

4. The manuscript contributes in socially just ways to knowledge in the field and/or to practice in research, teaching, or administration.
   __Strongly Agree
   __Agree
   __Disagree
   __Strongly Disagree

Overall Recommendation	
	Publish as is or with only minor revisions (very few manuscripts fall into this category)
	Revise and resubmit (with enthusiasm; the manuscript shows great promise as a draft)
	Revise and resubmit (with reservation; the manuscript has potential, but needs considerable revision, rethinking, recasting, or refocusing)
	Not well suited for publication in *WPA*.

Part Two: Detailed Responses

Please provide answers to the following questions. Responses will be shared with the author(s) of the manuscript.

1. Is this piece relevant for the *WPA* readership? Why or why not? If the manuscript seems better fitted for a different venue, please indicate where.

2. Does the author (or authors) of the manuscript adequately speak to their positionality relative to the material(s) included in the manuscript? How might the author(s) more fully consider their roles and their relationships to the issues and topics addressed in the article?

3. In what way does this manuscript productively disrupt and/or expand understandings and practices in the field? How might it accomplish these things more effectively?

4. Is the work contextualized effectively and inclusively within existing work? Does the manuscript meaningfully engage relevant perspectives and scholarship from diverse authors, including BIPOC, multiply marginalized (gender, race, ethnicity, disability, sexual identity, etc.), and underrepresented scholars? What additional resources might help the author(s) strengthen the manuscript in this area? In responding to the question, Dr. Cana Uluak Itchuaqiyaq's "Multiply Marginalized and Underrepresented (MMU) Scholars List" and "MMU Scholar Bibliography" may be of assistance:

   - Itchuaqiyaq, C. U. (2022, March 15). MMU scholar list. Cana Uluak Itchuaqiyaq. https://www.itchuaqiyaq.com/mmu-scholar-list

   - Itchuaqiyaq, C. U. (2021, June 7). MMU scholar bibliography. Cana Uluak Itchuaqiyaq. https://www.itchuaqiyaq.com/mmu-bibliography

5. Are there aspects or areas of the manuscript that might unintentionally do harm to or create trauma for readers? How might the author(s) revise these areas?

6. Please offer any additional suggestions for how this manuscript might be revised to better achieve the goals of the author(s) and promote anti-racist, inclusive, accessible conversations and practices in the field.

Are you willing to share your identity with the author(s)? (We strongly encourage, but do not require, that you append your name to your review)	
	Yes. Please share my name or identifying information with the author(s).
	No. I prefer to remain anonymous.

Please submit your completed review to wpaeditors@gmail.com. Please return the review form as a .doc or .docx file. Again, thank you for doing this important work. We appreciate your service to the journal!