Ma
I   a
V

Authored by Susan Jurow, Bill Penuel, & Leah Peña Teeters

A   , R   A

Aims

01.
To identify an artifact with your team that was designed collaboratively

02.
To make visible the diverse forms of activity that are involved in the successful implementation of the designed program

Activity Summary

This activity involves codifying the explicit and implicit and visible and invisible labor that surrounds one artifact. Collaborators ill use a shared template to document the emotional, temporal, and physical infrastructure required to implement a focal activity. Once all collaborators have documented their activities, they will work together to generate a robust picture of the re-sources required to implement one activity.

Rationale

This activity draws upon the concept of articulation ork, deÞned as the labor of coordinating or integrating dif erent strands of ork (see Strauss, 1985), and invisible labor, deÞned as ork that is intangible and often unrecogniæed (see Juro et al., 2016; Suchman, 1995). Taken together, the concepts of articulation ork and (in)visible labor help to conceptualiæe ho human activity is made possible by a constellation of factors, including explicit, implicit, tangible, and intangible factors. This activity seeks to support collaborators in making visible the emotional, temporal, and material infrastructure required to sustain projects.

I P ir S i

WHOLE GROUP PREWORK:

01.
Identify an artifact that was designed collaboratively (for example: an app, an evaluation tool, a lesson plan, a mentoring guide, etc.).

02.
Ask collaborators to first engage with focal ideas via writing. Introduce the concept by asking collaborators to respond to the prompt: "What conditions had to come together for this [the identified artifact] to come to be?" Once that is addressed, then ask collaborators to write on: "And what conditions had to come together for THAT to come to be?" and so on.

   a. Have collaborators write for 10 minutes in response to this repetitive prompt intended to develop multiple layers of a story.

      i. Encourage collaborators to write their story from an "I perspective."

   b. Share out, identifying contradictions and tensions.

INDIVIDUAL "TAKE HOME" ACTIVITY:

01.
Identify a week-long period where the selected artifact will be used. During the week of implementation or use, have collaborators create [digital journals](#) where collaborators can keep notes of their interactions with the artifact.

   c. Interactions consist of activities such as time thinking about the artifact, noticing feelings related to the artifact, conversations about the artifact, making adaptations to the artifact, work on the artifact.

WHOLE GROUP

02.
After one week of documenting, dedicate a meeting to sharing out the work that was involved in implementing the collaboratively designed artifact.

03.
Create a summary document of resources required, including time (e.g. time required to prepare, implement, build and maintain necessary relationships), emotional (e.g. time to process, skills to hold and navigate heavy emotions as a group), and material (e.g. physical resources).

04.
Discuss what infrastructure needs to be designed and maintained to sustain this work.

Modification Notes

- The team can modify the journal template to meet the needs of their specific project.

- To further address how power shapes in/visibility, the team should identify an artifact/reading that addresses how power is at play. As part of step 3, add a column in the journal for addressing how power shapes in/visibility or the lack thereof in the artifact/reading.

E 〽 〽 〽 〽 〽 〽 (ᴦ .)

structure to address the systemic issue of
food deserts in a community-generated and

“What is seen and hat is invisible, to hom and

Author Refs

Ahn, J., Van Steenis, E., & Penuel, W. R. (in press). Centering work to organize community-engaged research. In D. Peurach, J. Russell, L. Cohen-Vogel, W. R. Penuel, & D. Eddy-Spicer, (Eds), *Handbook of improvement research in education.* Routledge.

Marin, A., Stewart-Ambo, T., McDaid-Morgan, N., White Eyes, R., & Bang, M. (2020). Enacting relationships of kinship and care in educational and research settings. In A. I. Ali & T. McCarty (Eds.), *Critical youth research in education: Methodologies and praxis* (pp. 243-264). Routledge.

Orr, J. E., & Crowfoot, N. C. (1992). *Design by Anecdote -The use of ethnography to guide the application of technology to practice.* PDC.

Orr, J. E. (1990). Sharing knowledge, celebrating identity: War stories and community memory in a service culture. In D. Middleton & D. Edwards (Eds.), *Collective remembering: Memory in society* (pp. 169-189). Sage.

Penuel, W. R. (2019) Infrastructuring as a practice of design-based research for supporting and studying equitable implementation and sustainability of innovations. *Journal of the Learning Sciences,* 28(4-5), 659-677.

Star, S. L., & Strauss, A. (1999). Layers of silence, arenas of voice: The ecology of visible and invisible work. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* (CSCW), 8(1–2), 9–30.

Working Group

Jurow, A. S., Teeters, L., Shea, M., & Van Steenis, E. (2016). Extending the consequentiality of "invisible work" in the food justice movement. *Cognition and Instruction*, 34(3), 210-221.

Star, S. L. (1999). The ethnography of infrastructure. *The American Behavioral Scientist (Beverly Hills)*, 43(3), 377-391.

Strauss, A. (1985). Work and the division of labor. *Sociological Quarterly*, 26(1), 1-19.

Suchman, L. (1995). Making work visible. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(9), 56-64.