

How Do We Address the Behemoth?: Writing Program Administrators and GenAI

A Special Issue of *WPA* Edited By
Gavin P. Johnson, Texas Christian University
David F. Green Jr., Howard University
Lydia Wilkes, Auburn University

Yes, this is another CFP about GenAI.

The explosive growth of generative AI tools, especially LLMs like ChatGPT, over the last three years has led to robust discussion across higher education. There are varying views on GenAI that create questions about the research process, proper ways to acknowledge the technologies, and its mere use among teachers, students, and administrators. Just within rhetoric and composition we've seen numerous high profile special issue journals, engaging conference presentations, oft-cited stand-alone articles, award-winning studies, cross-organizational statements, and public-facing resources that detail the affordances and constraints of GenAI in/on our research, our classrooms, our universities, our bodyminds, our shared environment, and our ethics.

However, a collection of WPA voices on the topic of GenAI has yet to emerge. This, to us, is quite odd considering the important role WPAs play in acknowledging GenAI concerns, shaping GenAI policies, researching GenAI trends, offering/organizing GenAI-themed trainings and talks, sitting in on demonstrations with GenAI companies and university stakeholders, and much more. Can any WPA working today honestly say that they haven't had to address the behemoth that is GenAI and its influences in/on their programs?

For this special issue of *WPA: Writing Program Administration*—planned for publication in fall 2026—we invite proposals that explicitly focus on how WPAs and their teams have addressed GenAI in their local contexts. Specifically, we are interested in [Everything Is Praxis essays](#), counterstories, literacy narratives, dialogues, and empirical research reports that provide insight into the work WPAs are doing to shape GenAI use, policy, and literacy in their programs and on their campuses.

Some (but not all) questions you may consider:

- How did we get here?
- How do WPAs respond to the ethics of GenAI in writing programs?
- How do WPAs (re)establish programmatic values in the wake of GenAI?
- How do WPAs communicate nuanced perspectives about GenAI in the writing program to various audiences and stakeholders?
- How does university context and student population shape programmatic approaches to GenAI?

- How was your program's/university's GenAI policy composed and who helped shape it?
- How has GenAI been incorporated into the program's curriculum?
- How can GenAI use in a writing program curriculum be assessed?
- How have discussions about GenAI been incorporated into pedagogical training, especially for graduate students, full-time faculty (non-tenure track and tenure track), and part-time faculty?
- How has GenAI been incorporated into the administration of the writing program?
- How have certain technologies improved or complicated workflows for WPAs and their staff?
- How are we paying attention to not only the obvious GenAI integrations but also the technologies behind the scenes?
- How can/should/have WPAs protect(ed) student data and intellectual property?
- How do WPAs recognize and educate about the impact of GenAI on anti-racist pedagogies and linguistic justice?
- How have WPAs contended within their programs with GenAI's persuasive and deceptive capacities, challenge to perceptions of truth and trust, and other aspects of meaning-making upended by the illusion of humanity in machine-generated discourse?
- How have WPAs refused or resisted GenAI hype promulgated within institutions and with what programmatic results so far?
- How are writing programs outside of first-year writing (WAC/WID, Writing Centers, Professional and Technical Writing Programs, Creative Writing Programs, Centers for Teaching Excellence, etc.) addressing GenAI under their unique circumstances?
- How do we find (and become better) allies in these discussions?

You will note that each of these questions begin with “how.” This is intentional as we want to know *how WPAs are addressing GenAI*. We want to know your approach, your method, your orientation. **For this special issue, we are less concerned with big-picture stances or sweeping philosophies about GenAI and want to open space to share stories, resources, experiments, and ways forward.**

Editorial Philosophy:

In order to ensure the widest and largest number of perspectives can be published, we are intentionally limiting the length of all submissions regardless of genre to 3,000–4,000 words or fewer. We encourage submissions that offer insights from all types of writing programs and institutions, especially community colleges, regional universities, SLACS, HBCUs, HSIs, and/or research universities. Submissions will receive double-anonymous peer review from experts in the field.

As editors, we are dedicated to supporting the writers whose proposals we accept through the drafting, peer review, and publishing stages through generative feedback, consistent and speedy communication, and transparency about the process. We will practice the [antiracist review process designed by the journal](#) and work with peer reviewers to ensure ethical, appropriate, and timely feedback that meets the high standards set by *WPA*.

Timeline:

Proposals Due: October 27, 2025
Responses Sent: November 10, 2025
Drafts Due: February 2, 2025
Reviews Returned: mid-April, 2026
Revisions Returned: July 6, 2026
Publication: fall 2026

Submissions:

Please submit proposals of approximately 250 words by **October 27, 2025**. In your proposal, please be explicit about the genre you intend to compose (Everything Is Praxis, counterstory, literacy narrative, dialogue, research report, etc.).

[Submit your proposals to this Google Form.](#)

Full link:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScdM7ubp6r9Wb8qANrZ9o_qvOup_K2z-yLFRrJiPZlQIZUn_Q/viewform?usp=header

We are happy to answer questions, brainstorm ideas, and offer feedback! Contact Gavin Johnson (gavin.johnson@tcu.edu), David Green (david.f.green@howard.edu), and Lydia Wilkes (lcw0045@auburn.edu).