UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A REFLECTION ON ONE WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM MODEL

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

MARY CARTER
Norman, Oklahoma
2010

A REFLECTION ON ONE WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM MODEL

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

BY

____

Dr. Susan Kates, Chair

____

Dr. Kathleen Welch

____

Dr. Rita Keresztesi

____

Dr. Michele Eodice

____

Dr. Ellen Greene

© Copyright by MARY CARTER 2010
All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No one reaching the end of their Ph.D. program can ever claim to have achieved this accomplishment entirely on their own, and I am no exception. I would first like to recognize and thank my committee members, Dr. Susan Kates, Dr. Kathleen Welch, Dr. Rita Keresztezi, Dr. Michele Eodice, and Dr. Ellen Greene; they helped me to finish my degree in an expedient manner, even though under the pressure of time constraints. Many thanks are due to my committee chair, Dr. Kates, for working hard to make this happen. The University of Oklahoma would not have been my intellectual home for the past six years if I had not been inspired by the corpus of Dr. Welch's work, and I marvel at where that inspiration has led me. It was under the guidance of Dr. Eodice I undertook the endeavors written about in these pages, and I thank her for the opportunity. I learned so much from Dr. Eodice that continues to serve me well in my current position and will leave an indelible mark on my career path. Three dissertations could not encompass the knowledge I gained from my association with Dr. Eodice, and for this I will be forever grateful. Many thanks are due to the faculty partners, as well as their teaching assistants, whose narratives of change appear in these pages. My many supportive friends and colleagues in the Department of English and Writing Center provided me with a sense of community that has sustained me throughout my time at the University of Oklahoma; although away from home and family, I have never felt adrift thanks to these wonderful people. It is ironic how one must leave home in order to truly appreciate it. My heartfelt gratitude and love goes out to my mom and dad,

Donna and Roy Bauer, who throughout the past six years have put me up and put up with me for many trips home. Thanks and love go to my siblings, Pat, Steve, and Rick Bauer, as well for their unwavering support. But the person for whom I reserve the greatest thanks is the one who sacrificed the most for me to be here: my son Eric. During the time his mom has been on this ten-year mission of chasing down a dream, Eric has managed to grow into a outstanding young man, something she takes very little credit for. Thank you, kiddo; I love you. This is for you.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.. iv

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.. ix

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION.. 1

Early Twentieth Century: The Germanic Model

Composition and the Post-War Boom

Remedial Models in Writing Instruction

Going with the Flow: Composition and Cultural Change

2. 22

WAC Beginnings: Liberal Arts College Roots

What Sets the Liberal Arts Apart?

Normal Schools: Predisposed to Service

Institutional Contexts and Faculty Attitudes toward WAC

First-Wave WAC Models in Public Institutions

WAC and Research I Institutional Contexts

WAC Implementations at Our University

3. 54

Affecting Change One-to-One: Early Models of Writing Fellows' Work

Contemporary Writing Fellow Implementations

WAC, Faculty Development, and the One-to-One Relationship

WAC and the Writing Center: Shared Ideologies

A Theoretical Watershed: Composition Comes into its Own

Social Constructivism and Changes in Practice

Formalized Collaboration: Writing Consultancy

Goals: Whose Are They and How Do They Drive the Consultancy Relationship?

4. ………………………………………………………………………... 84

One-to-One Faculty Development at Our Institution

Writing Fellows Collaboration One: The Professor

Analysis—The Purchase Model of Writing Consultancy

Writing Fellows Collaboration Two: A Professor and her Two Graduate Teaching Assistants

Analysis—The Collaborative Model Fully Realized

Faculty Feedback—“That Certainly Helped a Lot”

Writing Fellows Collaboration Three: A Professor and his Graduate Teaching Assistant

Analysis—Positively Situated on the Continuum

5. ………………………………………………………………………… 133

Defining the Writing Fellow

Resistance and Expertise

The “Content Knowledge” of the Writing Fellow: Genre

The “Content Knowledge” of the Writing Fellow: Writing Process

The Writing Fellow as Practitioner

"The Reflective Turn"

Capturing Reflection-in-Action

The Potential for Assessment

The Case for Portfolio Assessment

Writing and Professional Priorities

REFERENCE LIST…………………………………………………….. 162

Appendix

1. Image capture of wiki……………………………………………..……… 169
2. Faculty feedback: Professor from second scenario……………..… 170

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure Page

1. Original assignment sheet requirements……………………….. 163

2. Paper “Layout” before revision…………………………………… 164

3. Paper “Layout” after revision……………………………………... 164

Chapter 1

Introduction

Writing has profound possibilities for helping students engage knowledge-making processes—this is the fundamental belief undergirding the implementation of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) in American colleges and universities. While WAC has a greater emphasis on pedagogy, teaching methods, and interdisciplinarity, it still retains its ideological home in the discipline of composition, as well as the teaching of writing, and from it draws much of its theoretical foundation. Composition courses and WAC projects address similar issues in that they both seek to provide students not with rigid writing templates, but with a skill set that supports writing as inquiry. At our large doctoral granting institution, the WAC initiative is based in the Writing Center, which also enjoys a close relationship with the First-Year Composition program. The writing fellow narratives within these pages are populated with graduate research assistants whose training was grounded the English Department's Composition Program; they also formed the core of the Gen Ed (General Education) team that was the forerunner of the writing fellows initiative.

This dissertation picks up at that juncture: It briefly summarizes the results of the Gen Ed team's efforts in the mid 2000s and describes the launch of the Writing Fellows initiative at the University of Oklahoma in the fall of 2007. Prior to that implementation, the Gen Ed team, comprised of three English graduate research assistants, was charged to work with departments who required

assistance on improving student writing within their discipline; the request on the department's behalf was made usually by personally petitioning the department head of English who oversaw the team. The beginnings of these departmental and interdisciplinary relationships were usually very exciting and full of promise, but interest on the side of the departmental faculty would always wane, usually in correlation with the pace of the semester. The final Gen Ed engagement with a department in the social sciences detailed here evinces this trend and others that served to derail the long-term impacts of the project. Issues that worked against the sustainability of the team's efforts included the lack of concerted support throughout the department, dependence on already overburdened junior faculty, resistance to some of the team's methods, and reliance on a WAC tool, the workshop, with dubious lasting impact. But with the arrival of a new writing center director, a Ph.D. who would spearhead a new WAC initiative, the protocols for working with other departments would be completely re-imagined.

The tired workshop method of WAC implementation was falling far short of the expectations of everyone—the dean, the departmental faculty, and the members of the Gen Ed team—but it was the only option the team was given with which to proceed. The new director offered a multi-faceted approach that appealed to both departments requesting assistance with undergraduate writing (a department in the hard sciences in the first scenario) as well as the team members, who were now known as writing fellows. In this tiered support system, the director placed herself as the one to make not only the initial contact with the department head but also in a constant direct dialogue with him; the emphasis on

building productive long-term working relationships was modeled from the top down. Another graduate research assistant served as the point person, or go-to intermediary, for the writing fellows working within the department and simultaneously cultivated new departmental relationships. The graduate research assistants who served as writing fellows were assigned to self-selected professors to provide their expertise at implementing quality writing assignments that addressed the goals of disciplinary content knowledge. In the context of these unique collaborative relationships, the seeds of a sustainable WAC implementation were planted.

One of the claims this dissertation makes, however, is that an implementation that utilizes methods that are ineffective and/or never interrogated is an invitation to futility. While the traditional WAC workshop has been the mode of choice for carrying the WAC message for many years and at a variety of institutions, it was found to be unsuccessful as a vehicle for change at our institution. In light of this one of the first tasks of this dissertation in the Introduction (Chapter 1) and Chapter 2 is to situate historically writing across the curriculum instruction as well as the workshop method to reveal the ideologies underlying its broad and unquestioned acceptance. A lineage from the Harvard writing classrooms of one hundred years ago can be traced as the history of WAC within the context of undergraduate writing instruction is considered. For this project, situating WAC historically is vital because it evinces the theoretical evolution that has taken place and which informs the Writing Fellows program here at our institution. Writing across the curriculum programs may be perceived

as interloping to those outside of the English composition department and as "turncoats" to those inside the discipline, but the fact remains that WAC utilizes composition theory to build a bridge between the writing instruction offered in freshman composition and that occurring throughout a student's academic career. Chapter 3 looks at how writing across the curriculum, writing centers, and first-year composition share many common theoretical influences; social constructivism and writing process theory in particular provide a lineage to the writing fellows' methodology. The one-to-one consultancy mode of WAC in the form of a writing fellow can be compared to writing center tutors, who call on diverse skills to react to in-the-moment pedagogical situations. Other conceptions of writing fellows work are examined here and analyzed for strengths and weaknesses, however, a brief glance at universities comparable to ours suggests that none are implementing WAC with writing fellows in the same fashion.

Chapter 4 comprises the heart of the research and is where I recount my writing fellows experiences using the extensive notes I kept throughout the endeavor. The chapter is adapted seamlessly from the notes to provide the effect of a smooth narrative, and it is essential to consider that the described events first took place beginning three years prior. The detail contained within the original notes was enhanced by a process known as "reflective sense making"[1], which was used to provide a framework for the experiences of the

[1] See Weick, Karl E. *Sensemaking in Organizations* discussion on frameworks for sense making (pp. 2-6). Weick asserts that stimuli, especially new or unusual, is best understood when put in

collaborations. The use of a retrospective and self-reflective framework provides for a more in-depth and consistent analysis of practice as well as allowing the progress of the faculty participants to be viewed as occurring on a continuum.

One key to determining the overall success of a WAC endeavor is if it is proves to be sustainable over time, which means it is essential that the writing fellows method is replicable. The objective of the final chapter, Chapter 5, is to attempt to quantify what knowledge a writing fellow needs to facilitate a productive working relationship with disciplinary faculty. In early WAC narratives, collegiality is relied upon to smooth the way for collaborations that are based on mutually shared goals between to equal peers; if the collaboration failed, it was owed to a poor relationship and viewed as one of the vagaries of this type of engagement. But the impetus for WAC work in large doctoral-granting or research universities is too strong, budgets are too tight, and faculty members' time is too restricted to rely on collegiality to structure an implementation. Instead writing fellows must be trained in the specifics needed for the collaborative relationship and require a strong knowledge of disciplinary genre (and their inherent ideologies) and writing process. They need instruction in self-reflective practice and reflection-in-action techniques to maximize their learning curve and allow them to be situationally responsive. This chapter also addresses issues of assessment and indicates future directions for writing fellows initiatives.

---

frameworks and then reflected upon in retrospect, thus making it a "meaningful lived experience" (p. 24).

By historically situating and analyzing WAC implementation and methodology, in specific workshop versus one-to-one collaborative modes, this dissertation seeks to determine if the writings fellows model is appropriate for our university and amenable to replication in similar institutions. Through reflective sense making techniques and using self-interrogative notes, the narratives of faculty movement along a continuum of WAC acceptance are detailed and analyzed for the project's overall efficacy. The research notes how the adoption of new knowledge occurs, in both the faculty partner as well as the writing fellow, and how formalized self-reflection can enhance that process. This dissertation offers an overview and critique of a responsive and ultimately sustainable WAC initiative, provides specifics for the purpose of reproduction, hints at assessment potential, and indicates possible future directions.

In the sections immediately following I will examine writing pedagogy in the modern university, the development of composition as a discipline, and subsequent implementation of programs geared toward the overall objective of improving undergraduate writing.

Early Twentieth Century: The Germanic Model

The teaching of writing has had a formal, though often contentious, place in American colleges and universities since the beginning of the twentieth century. The need for basic writing instruction for all students, a seemingly straightforward enterprise at the outset, provided the impetus for the cleaving off of composition as a discipline separate from English as the structure of the

modern university developed from the Germanic model. The need for instruction of undergraduates in writing and the development of composition theory, composition as a discipline, and subsequent genesis of the writing center and writing across the disciplines subspecialties have run along parallel tracks. Thus, the history of undergraduate writing instruction provides a backdrop and context for understanding the influences, such as writing process and social constructivism theories, motivating the genesis of the first writing across the curriculum programs in the 1970s.

Universities at the beginning of the twentieth century were firmly entrenched in the Germanic model. However, conflicting notions of writing instruction, its place in higher education, and how to address it in the college curriculum appeared. Increased specialization precluded the explicit teaching of writing in favor of disciplinary content material and coincided naturally with the research-driven agenda prevalent in the German university model. The purpose of higher education as perceived at that time was to produce professionals—doctors, lawyers, engineers—who through a system of meritocracy would go on to build the rapidly-industrializing country. A university education was also viewed as a natural step on the path to self-actualization within certain social strata, with the belief that young students would eventually take their places in the upper echelons of society predicated a command of the English language. It was at this time composition first began to be conceived as a standard requirement of all undergraduates pursuing a degree; the teaching of writing was removed from other courses and in many institutions was located in the English

department. With that move a relationship began that has influenced writing instruction beyond measure, because within English departments, the divide between the texts that were studied and the texts produced by students was seen not only as unbridgeable, but not even on the same plane of existence. Oftentimes, the study of literature was viewed through the lens of liberal self-actualization; authors were created by the lucky accident of brilliance or visited by a muse.[2] The solitary genius paradigm valorized in Western literature rejected student writing out of hand as not legitimate because the gift of writing good prose was viewed as only bestowed upon a select few. Composition as a formal discipline found its beginnings in attempts to demystify the writing process and would eventually find validation outside of literature .

Concurrently, the university was making its transition from an older language-based model focused on the study of philosophy and classical languages to the favored research model, which emphasized advancing more pragmatic concerns as opposed to cultural aspects (1998, p. 7). James Berlin (1987)[3] [4] notes how having a required writing course offered by the English

---

[1]As noted by Jessica Yood (2003), this view is first articulated in the premiere issue of PMLA (1894-1895) by Thomas W. Hunt, a professor of rhetoric, who argues that the writing performed about something is altogether different than “literature or literary criticism” (p. 527). She posits that “with this distinction the segregation between writing and ‘real writing’, between academia and literature, is born” (p. 527)

[2]Berlin’s *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing and Instruction in American Colleges,1900-1995* is used extensively in the Introduction, primarily for his ideological and pedagogical analysis of writing instruction. Berlin establishes how “three major approaches” (p. 35)—current-traditional rhetoric, “the rhetoric of the meritocracy”; “rhetoric of the liberal culture” (p. 35); and transactional rhetoric, which provided the basis for the Progressivism movement. Such distinctions are vital because modern pedagogical methods are in many ways a reaction, in particular to current traditional, modes of instruction.

[3]David Gold, however, in *Rhetoric at the Margins: Revising the History of Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1873-1947,* points out that “James Berlin’s histories of rhetoric and writing instruction in American colleges, while offering a groundbreaking taxonomy of epistemological

department highlighted “a conflict between those who saw literacy as utilitarian and those who saw it as self-fulfillment” (p. 39). As a split occurred it also heightened different interpretations of how to evaluate student writing, and the greatest emphasis was placed on correctness of grammar and other mechanical features, with the prevailing type of writing instruction in the first part of the twentieth century identified by Berlin (1987) as “current traditional” (p.36).[5] At Harvard in 1914, composition instruction took a form still recognizable at many large universities; the sequence was divided into two semesters of first, basic writing and secondly, composing reasoned argumentative discourse. But as noted by David Russell (2002), the writing produced by students for these courses was becoming disconnected from the writing expected of them throughout their major courses, and, spurred by growing specialization, the composing process for their own disciplines was increasingly more transparent (Russell, 2002). Consideration was never given to how to prepare students to write for their disciplines, and therefore, the learning process was usually accomplished by trial and error. The responsibility for writing instruction would continue to shift toward the freshman composition sequence as the disciplines matured, with the bulk of attention given to attempts at correcting “illiteracies” in student writing (Berlin, 1987, p. 41). These developments in turn affected the evolution of composition as a discipline; as noted by Sharon Crowley (1998),

---

foundations of rhetorical practices, also grants great cultural power to the work of elite theorists and to institutional artifacts, such as textbooks, in promulgating problematic ideologies” (p.6).

[5]In *Electric Rhetoric: Classical Rhetoric, Oralism, and a New Literacy*, Kathleen E. Welch (1999) further defines Berlin’s current-traditional model as relying on “drill-based instruction” with rigid standards for correctness and a rule-based approach. She posits the current-traditional author as “universal, reliable, and stable” and who “reports from a position outside history to a universal audience” (p.15)

"scholarship in composition grew directly out of the pedagogical challenges faced by people assigned to teach the first year course" (p. 3). Their difficulties were compounded in that the emphasis on the students' written product as a form of assessment had decreased in the other disciplines because content professors did not have time to use it. The research model used lectures to convey information and tests to assess comprehension, whereas before the advent of the Germanic model, students wrote extensively for grades as part and parcel of their educational careers. The shift meant students' daily writings within their disciplines, now in the form of lecture notes, were never evaluated or commented upon (Runciman, 1998). Instead, such responsibilities were left to an English instructor who would attempt to teach writing devoid of disciplinary content. Ultimately, this system created frustration all around as faculty blamed the English department for students' inferior writing skills and beleaguered English departments grew increasingly defensive.

Composition and the Post-War Boom

In the first part of the twentieth century, during the Progressive Era and in contrast to the Harvard model of writing instruction widely adopted by large universities, other views on undergraduate writing instruction were also exerting some influence. Progressive educational ideals such as "self-development, social harmony, and economic integration" were seen as a direct response to current-traditional emphases on empirical evidence and rational deduction (Berlin, 1987, p. 47). Particularly intriguing were the educational philosophies espoused by Fred Newton Scott at the University of Michigan, a colleague of

John Dewey, whom Berlin credits as providing the foundation for an epistemic pedagogy that considers all elements of a rhetorical situation. Berlin notes how Scott's perspectives differed greatly from those driving the current-traditional modes of instruction, which were shaped by scientific method: "Scott saw reality as a social construction, a communal creation emerging from the dialectical interplay of individuals. While this social reality is bound by the material, it is everywhere immersed in language" (Berlin, 1987, p. 47). Progressivists drew from the social sciences and believed strongly in the element of individual experience that helps to create every interaction. Although they had limited immediate impact on curricula, the Dewey-influenced Scott and others brought important notions into play that would affect the development of writing instruction, such as the concept of writing as a process, and also foresaw the flood of written communication, in the form of memos, business correspondence, etcetera, that would impact literacy requirements for modern life (Russell, 2002).

Writing instruction during the first part of the twentieth century in America universities was implemented via three predominant guiding philosophies: the current-traditional as evinced by the Harvard model, progressivism, and the liberal culture model, which stressed maximizing individual, God-given potential. Because a college education was still viewed as a privilege of the upper classes, the scattershot approach to undergraduate writing was a tenable means to obtain the select few students needed to proceed to graduate work or research, who would then ascend to their place in the meritocracy. But with the end of the second World War, the desire and means of students to pursue higher education

threatened to outstrip institutions' ability to handle the sudden influx . Berlin (1987) notes:

> The most significant curricular development in American colleges between 1940 and 1960 was the mushrooming of the general education movement. This movement first made an impact after World War I as an attempt to find a group of courses that would compensate for the specialization encouraged by the new emphasis on training for the professions…After the war, these programs increased dramatically, colleges again trying to combine the breadth of liberal learning with professional specialization. (p. 92)

Enrollment, which tripled between 1945 and 1965, simultaneously shaped the implementation of the freshman composition sequence as part of a general education requirement and the delineation of composition as a legitimate discipline; Russell (2002) points outs how during "the growth of higher education in the postwar era, not only of the size and number of institutions but in the variety of programs they offered, increased differentiation exponentially" (p.239.) The burgeoning specialization affecting the university as a whole influenced the maturation of composition as a discipline, and some faculty pushed to split from English as the study of literature and form their own sub-specialty. [6] Berlin (1987) reports that the CCCC (Conference of College Communication and Composition, composition's flagship conference), spearheaded by the director of English at Purdue, George F. Wykoff and University of Iowa's John Gerber, first met as an official entity cleaved from the National Council for Teachers of English

[6]In her insightful study *Authoring A Discipline: Scholarly Journals and the Post-World War II Emergence of Rhetoric and Composition*, Maureen Daly Goggins ties the disappearance of rhetoric in the early part of the century to a lack of space in the academy for it to develop. The bifurcation of literary studies and writing instruction helped spur the growth of composition studies, which then demanded the development of disciplinary journals.

(NCTE) in Chicago in 1949 (p. 105). Its establishment of a eponymous companion journal in 1950 was integral to providing a community for developing a theoretical foundation for the teaching of writing beyond correcting obvious mechanical deficiencies, though it would take time before new writing theories would take hold.

Communications, as a discipline, continued to develop through the postwar boom, influenced by earlier Progressivist notions; the modern age demanded articulate efficient information exchanges to facilitate the smoothly turning wheels of progress. As indicated by their joint conference and journal, the fields of English and communications became closely aligned. In the second issue of *The Conference of College Communication and Composition,* circa 1950, "Workshop Number 2" outlines a primary communication course goal—to "develop all of the language skills needed by the individual for effective living"—in a manner resonant with common expectations for freshman composition ("The function of the communication course in general education: The report of workshop 2 " p. 7). The focus communications brought to practical writing and speaking skills complemented the freshman composition sequence and helped institutions prepare the explosion of new students for their major courses. Inclusion of theoretical work from communications also broadened composition studies because it looked at how language functioned and spurred a revival of classical rhetoric used for this purpose. Trends emphasizing the study of language and writing evinced in the latter 1940s and 1950s are important in light of other educational trends of the time, such as increased use of computerized

marking systems like Scantron testing and ever-larger class sizes, because they reflect an interest in improving the critical thinking skills of students as opposed to current-traditionalist notions of correctness. The latter scenario, which became more common, encouraged rote memorization of specialized disciplinary content knowledge and relied little on writing as an instructional tool. This meant students remained challenged by writing tasks within their discipline, such as lab reports and capstone papers, long after they had left the composition classroom behind.

Remedial Models in Writing Instruction

During and after World War II, as colleges and universities struggled to accommodate more students less prepared for the writing demands of their academic careers, "writing clinics and writing laboratories …[became] increasingly popular …as remedial agencies for removing students' deficiencies in composition" (Moore, 1950, p. 388). As the previous quote alludes, in spite of the new theories of learning and writing beginning to take hold, assessment of student writing usually was driven by current-traditional concerns: grammar, mechanics, syntax, etcetera, and writing clinics were seen as the remedy at a time when all remedial services for students were expanding. In his 1950 *College English* article, Robert H. Moore (1950) discusses the "deficient" student and his or her problems in medical metaphors: "diagnoses" are made, "clinicians" treat, and remedial measures are "prescribed" (p. 394-395), though unlike the practice of medicine, writing lab work is not seen as laudable. Instead, Moore notes that "the handling of remedial composition problems…[is] a necessary, if

deplorable, part of the task of American colleges and universities" (p. 396). The writing clinic or lab had the advantage of being somewhat outside of the traditional university structure, which allowed it more pedagogical freedom. Carrie Ellen Stanley (1943), an assistant professor in charge of the remedial writing lab at the State University of Iowa, noted the work with students taking place there was "characterized by individual instruction" (p. 424). The writing clinic/lab continued to be the site of conflicting aims; those who staffed them saw students as having a real desire to engage the material but needing one-on-one guidance, while outside faculty derisively regarded lab work as "spoon feeding" and groused over a lack of student accountability (Stanley, 1943, p. 427). English departments were primarily responsible for the campus writing lab, ensuring the theoretical linage that would continue to develop between composition and writing center theory. The writing lab (eventually to become widely known as the "writing center"), though at the outset geared toward augmenting current-traditional modes of instruction, was foundational in incorporating one-on-one engagement with contemporary pedagogical practices. This, as well as less-hierarchical and self-directed student interaction, has proven to be an enduring legacy of writing center work.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, undergraduate writing instruction maintained a status quo, with most colleges and universities relying on the freshmen composition sequence in the current-traditional model with clinics and writing labs providing remedial assistance. But this curricular design, although widely implemented, was still not considered optimal, and, as Hermann C.

Bowersox (1955) speculates in a 1955 *College Composition and Communication* article, "The Idea of a Freshman Composition Course: A Polemical Discussion", "The freshman composition course may seem to fail because too much is expected of it" (p. 38). Although combining forces with communications provided the still-formative discipline of composition with greater theoretical and institutional heft, it still lacked influence in the university; as a result programmatic issues remained stagnant. Russell (2002) notes: "With a more homogeneous student population and a stable institutional climate, … pressures [influencing programmatic decisions] came chiefly from advocates of higher standards and the status quo" (p. 270). Having absorbed the wave of returning G.I.s by implementing various forms of general education curricula requirements, institutions consolidated their power while riding a higher education boom. Admission standards continued to rise, and a heavy emphasis was placed on science and engineering in response to the Soviet Union and the Cold War threat. Universities and colleges continued to rely on high schools, where predominantly current-traditionalist methods were used, to impart the skills students would need for college-level writing.

Going With the Flow: Composition and Cultural Change

The tidal wave of cultural change engulfing the United States throughout the late sixties and early seventies was not without correlation in American colleges and universities, though noticeable differences took place at a slower rate across institutions. But the influential theories of this generation of scholars had lasting effects on composition studies, and the teaching of writing as a

"communitarian vision in American social and educational thought" compelled compositionists to incorporate what was happening outside the classroom within (Russell, 2002, p. 272). The hierarchy of the classroom was disrupted as student-centered learning gained prominence, and current-traditional ideas of knowledge were upended. A legacy from the Progressivists of the twenties and thirties, an epistemic understanding, in perfect resonance with contemporary sensibilities, was deployed to inform composition pedagogy. Epistemic rhetoric, unlike the current-traditional perspective, opened up "knowledge" for debate, as Berlin (1987) points out:

> From the epistemic perspective, knowledge is not a static entity located in the external world, or in subjective states, or even in correspondence between external and internal structures. Knowledge is dialectical, the result of a relationship involving the interaction between opposing elements. (p. 166)

The notion of created, as opposed to *a priori,* knowledge resounded within composition theory and expanded its breadth because "it emphasize[d] the role language plays in constructing what cultures regard as knowledge or truth (Covino, 1995, p. 83). This view came to be known as social constructivism, and drawing from the works of theorists such as Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky, who was writing in the early part of the century but was embraced in the latter, scholars studied the interconnections between language, learning, and social relationships. Social constructivists such as Kenneth Bruffee presented new ideas about collaboration and knowledge formation. In a 1972 *College English* article "Collaborative Learning: Some Practical Models", Bruffee challenged the hierarchical manner in which classrooms were structured, claiming this inhibited

the social or co-learning that came naturally to human beings. Relationships formed through collaboration take on great importance, and Bruffee notes how greater care is given to maintaining collaboratively learned knowledge versus that gained through a solitary mode. He stresses throughout how learning takes place within a web of social relationships. Bruffee would later go on to further coalesce these ideas in "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'" in 1984, but the important groundwork for social constructivism theories had been successfully laid down.

Janet Emig, (1977) also known for her important research on theorizing the writing process in 1972, noted in her *College Composition and Communication* article "Writing as a Mode of Learning" how "writing uniquely corresponds to certain powerful learning strategies" (p. 122). One of the tactics enhanced via the writing process is revision, which means throughout the composing process, the writer is compelled to review and rethink his or her choices. Not only are grammatical and mechanical decisions assessed but the connections between ideas may be reconsidered as well. Emig cites Vygotsky and argues working within the composing process compels writers to address the structure of their thoughts within larger contexts. Emig's work on the writing process as a learning process cannot be understated, as process pedagogy is now standard in the composition classroom. Composition theorists like Emig and Bruffee, as well as others doing important research at this time, drew from psychology, cognitive psychology, cultural studies, structural linguistics, rhetoric, and literary studies to develop the theoretical underpinning for composition

studies as a discipline. As a result, composition was being viewed with greater importance in the academy as a discipline and as more integral to academic success within the university.

The culture for research that had been fostered in academe throughout most of the twentieth century, and likewise in composition studies, was partially enabled by a steady increase in student enrollments accompanied by more selective admissions. Having survived the immediate postwar boom, institutions continued to focus on their research mission, while undergraduate education, in particular composition, was kept on the back burner, with some freshman composition courses even being eliminated (Russell, 2002, p. 272). Freshman composition was viewed as a consumer of resources because writing was time consuming to teach and grade and required small class sizes; a 1973 survey discovered that 24% of four-year universities had no freshman composition requirement (Berlin, 1987, p. 275). In the face of cutbacks, compositionists were attempting to implement new pedagogy but still faced resistance and a lack of support from their faculty colleagues in other disciplines as well as the institution. Writing instruction in American universities and colleges was at a crossroads, and forged by ideological, social, political, educational, and economic pressures, it was to undergo innumerable changes in the coming decades.

The "Literacy Crisis"

Americans born before 1960 may recall the *Newsweek* cover of December 9, 1975, which demanded to know "Why Johnny Can't Write." While the tone of

the article would later be decried as alarmist and inflammatory, it would set off a cascade of finger-pointing and buck-passing, including as it did the most recent crop of SAT scores. The SAT scores of college freshman had dropped to their lowest point in twelve-years; this information combined with results from the most recent National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) in 1974, which showed a steady decline in student performance since 1969, fanned the "American literacy crisis" to a "fever pitch" (Russell, 2002, pp. 275-76). Just what the declining scores indicated is still open to debate; without doubt many complex variables, including the increasing literacy sophistication required for modern life, exerted their influence. Lester Faigley and Thomas P. Miller posit "It is no coincidence the 'literary crisis' occurred at a time when many colleges and universities were reducing or abolishing their writing programs while the jobs their graduates were entering increasingly required more writing" (Faigley & Miller, 1982, p. 569). Programmatic trends skewing toward eliminating the writing component from general education requirements suffered from poor timing due to cultural shortsightedness.

As Faigley and Miller's observation suggests, the appropriateness of institutional moves to de-emphasize composition were ill-advised because of another culturally-rooted force sweeping higher education. Open admissions policies, first implemented at CUNY, were the bell-weather of a massive shift as many groups who faced inequitable access to higher education, such as women and minorities, were accepted into institutions of higher learning. Many who participated in the open-admissions education boom were first-generation college

students who came from high school backgrounds with far more variance than had been seen before. Colleges and universities were called upon to be accountable to their communities more than any other time in their histories, and as a result, programmatic and curricular changes were implemented. Composition was prepared to rise to the challenge facing higher education; fortified with theoretical support from more established disciplines, it had established pedagogy for not only first-year composition, but for the writing process in many contexts. The writing-as-learning classroom, the knowledge-formation communities of social constructivism, and collaborative learning in non-hierarchical settings—these were the bold new ideas composition scholars were putting into practice in part as a result of the tumultuous early Seventies. The ensuing decades would see writing instruction branch out deeper into the university to address the needs of students.

Chapter 2

Writing across the curriculum programs first arose in the late 1970s as a response to perceived weaknesses in undergraduate writing instruction and have been active in various manifestations at diverse institutions ever since. When examining any type of writing instruction methodology, it is vital to situate it within a historical context. The implications of how the workshop became the WAC instructional vehicle of choice are examined here historically within the larger framework of writing pedagogy. First wave (roughly 1977-1992) iterations of WAC took hold in small liberal arts colleges and helped to establish practices which greatly influenced how writing across the curriculum initiatives were implemented. From inception, although overall their objectives are aimed at affecting student writing, most programs have been geared toward a faculty development model; in fact, as noted by David Russell, one administrator proclaimed "'WAC is the cheapest faculty development program you can buy"' (Russell, 2002, p. 298). Using workshops as their primary mode of conveyance, WAC initiatives seek to help faculty across the disciplines be more aware of the writing process, less focused on mechanical writing issues, and more likely to view writing as a means of facilitating course objectives, even in disciplines not traditionally viewed as writing intensive. Interdisciplinary workshops[7] have been

---

[7] Referred to extensively throughout this chapter, the interdisciplinary workshop model which has been in place since the beginnings of WAC, is implemented in a familiar workshop format. Conceived of as a small (10-15 participants) group of interdisciplinary faculty (Walvoord, 1992), the workshop is facilitated by WAC personnel and includes "a smorgasbord of strategies to improve both writing and learning" with topics including "such writing-based concepts as journal writing, peer review, audience analysis, writing for real audiences, revision, formative evaluation, assignment design, [and] critical thinking" (Jablonski, 2006, p. 101) While all of these aspects

viewed as promoting the development of faculty "as a true community of writers"; this is perceived as essential for faculty to learn principals they could then apply in the classroom (Susan H. McLeod & Emery, 1988, p. 67). In spite of the enthusiasm they have engendered for their potential to "change" faculty attitudes about writing (Weiss & Peich, 1980; Fulwiler, 1986; Magnotto & Stout, 1992), as WAC programs enter the third wave, interdisciplinary workshops are being reappraised for their ability to sustain WAC for the long term at diverse institutions. The best features of the workshop model—interdisciplinary collaboration, facilitated discussion about the writing process, examination of goals and objectives, and support—remain as important elements of virtually every WAC endeavor. But it is inconclusive as to whether insights gained by faculty during workshops are still being utilized and built upon as time elapses and they are back in their respective departments.

For larger institutions, this problem is compounded by the insularity of disciplinary departments, where individual faculty members may have little collegial backing in their efforts to incorporate more writing into their courses. Unlike the smaller colleges where the WAC first started in the 1970s, large state schools like ours have been limited in their attempts to maintain a WAC program centered around the workshop model and have been exploring alternative methods. However, to dismiss the interdisciplinary workshop without closer analysis would be regrettable. By examining the WAC interdisciplinary workshop

---

may or may not be present in every WAC workshop, an overarching emphasis on attitude change and community building usually motivates the proceedings.

as an artifact[8], we can glean insight into the very particular contexts—institutional, cultural, and professional—influencing its development. As noted by David Prior (1998), artifacts are "durable symbolic forms, like…specialized disciplinary discourses", which are "internalized by and distributed across persons" (Prior, 1998, p. 31). Analysis of the interdisciplinary workshop will indicate that it arose as the primary method of WAC implementation largely due to the positive feelings it provoked in faculty as opposed to any hard evidence of efficacy in a particular type of institutional setting. The workshop fades as a compelling force when looking to long term goals. Isolating the factors leading to the privileging of the interdisciplinary workshop as the primary mode of implementation is the first step in clarifying programmatic goals and determining methods for third wave WAC endeavors.

WAC Beginnings: Liberal Arts College Roots

The beginnings of writing across the curriculum programs first took hold in the 1970s, as noted by Russell in *Writing in the Academic Disciplines: A Curricular History*, in "small, private liberal arts colleges with selected admissions" (Russell, 2002, p. 282), and the homogeneity of these institutions had a profound influence on how early WAC objectives and methods of implementation were articulated. The schools most often pointed to as comprising the genesis of writing across the curriculum, Carleton College,

[8] A definition of "artifact" provided by Merriam-Webster will help to further elucidate the importance of using this term for purposes here: "something characteristic of or resulting from a particular human institution, period, trend, or individual." The implication is that by classifying the interdisciplinary workshop as an "artifact," it may be viewed more objectively and separately from confounding emotional factors.

Central College, and Beaver College (Russell, 2002), had much in common as well as their status as small elite institutions. Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota, began exploring the potential for writing across the curriculum in the mid Seventies and is many times presented as the first to address the concerns about writing that were foremost in the national consciousness (Russell, 2002). Representing perhaps the most elite example, Carleton College is the epitome of the selective private college, currently ranked the eighth best private liberal arts college in America with an acceptance rate of 29.8% ("Carleton College," 2009). Central College in Pella, Iowa, and Beaver College (now Arcadia University) in Glenside, Pennsylvania, both have nationally ranked programs at their institutions, though not the particularly strong undergraduate focus retained by Carleton ("Central College," 2009). Not as exclusive as Carleton, acceptance rates for Central and Beaver Colleges are 79.3% and 75%, respectively ("Central College," 2009). The communities in which all three colleges reside were either founded or heavily influenced by white European immigrants, have populations under twenty thousand, and are in the Midwest or Upper Midwest region of the country. Each of the three institutions were founded in the mid-eighteen hundreds by religious orders: Beaver College, 1853, Methodist Episcopal Church ("About Arcardia," 2009); Central College, 1854, originally Baptist, then Reformed Church (US News and World Report 2009); and Carleton College, 1866, Conference of Congregational Churches (Carleton College). A characteristic of such medium- sized Midwestern burgs is the homogeneity of

their populations—racially, ethnically and ideologically—which generally leads to stability and goodwill in the communities.

But the resemblance between these three 1970s WAC pioneers is deeper than the simply the schools' historical and community contexts; they share similar attitudes about their educational mission, which cause them to hew to similar compelling ideologies.[9] Serving undergraduate student bodies of between eight to twelve hundred students, these smaller institutions have a markedly different focus than larger research universities. As would be expected, their fine arts programs are deep and various as well as amply supported. All three stress diverse experiences as integral to a challenging liberal arts program and highlight their study abroad programs. At their most fundamental level, these small private liberal arts institutions espouse the importance of the humanities to becoming a well-rounded participant in today's global society. Therefore, their goals may be articulated in a manner that upon first analysis, does not seem to speak to a now-commonly held view on the "purpose" of education—to secure employment one's chosen profession (Stone, 2004). On its website, Central College states: "Central prides itself on building a community of faculty, staff, and students who live out its attributes including integrity, mutual respect, safety, responsiveness, compassion, justice, service to others and energy" (Central College 2009). Small private institutions in the traditional liberal arts mold believe in wider definitions of undergraduate education where knowledge does not necessarily have immediate

[3]At this time, WAC programs, in their infancy at small liberal arts colleges, were not even conceived of as such at larger state schools and Research I institutions.

practical application and the whole of one's academic career is greater than the sum of its parts.

What Sets the Liberal Arts Apart?

Their *artes liberalis* perspective attract many faculty who seek an academic freedom unlike the type tenure provides; instead, faculty may relish the opportunities for multi-disciplinary collaboration available at small liberal arts colleges. Looking back on her early experiences at a such an institution, one thirty-year academic recalls:

> At this very collegial, small place—which had about 1,000 students at that time—a highly collegial environment, a faculty that was used to working well together, a very high faculty governance tradition, a tradition of trust between faculty and administrators, and a tradition of doing things together. (Jablonski, 2006, p. 63)

Instructors at these institutions are allowed more latitude in where they apply their intellectual energies; many choose to venture outside the delimitations of their own training into collaborative endeavors. A professor teaching at Whitford, a selective private college of 2,000 students in the Northwest, notes "The liberal arts means really liberating things" (B. E. Walvoord, Hunt, L.L., Dowling, H.F., Jr., & McMahon, J.D. , 1997, p. 72). In part, the phenomenon of faculty in small liberal arts colleges having diverse focuses is due to necessity as well because their academic departments are not as deeply staffed as those of research institutions.

An environment congenial to collaboration[10] fosters the collegiality[11] drawing many academics to seek positions at private liberal arts institutions. For junior faculty the process of securing a tenure-track position already causes a great deal of anxiety; at a research institution, the subsequent pressure for them to achieve tenure may seem daunting. Reflecting on her recent job search, Kristin Ghodsee notes how "some people thrive on the cutthroat competition of the bigger university", but she preferred the "more collegial" environment at the exclusive liberal arts school at which she now teaches (Ghodsee, 2008). "Community" is a central tenet of the small liberal arts institution; contained within this notion are ideas of mutual respect, collegiality and a shared vision. Here in the institutions where the writing across the curriculum movement experienced its first growth, the groundwork predisposing faculty to be receptive to WAC ideas was already in place. The genesis of a WAC workshop model steeped in collegiality and collaboration had almost immediate credibility with faculty in the context of the small liberal arts college because it resonated with the tenor of their day-to-day academic lives.

Normal Schools—Predisposed to Service

As writing across the curriculum expanded into public institutions in the latter part of the 1970s, it found the most receptivity in those already predisposed

[10] Collaboration, as defined broadly here can be comprised of the many ways in which academics engage each other in professional life, though we are warned by Ede and Lunsford (1986) that there are "dangers inherent in any over simple idealization of collaborative practices" (p. viii). They define collaboration as occurring in two modes: hierarchical, which is "carefully, often rigidly, structured, driven by highly specific goals and by people playing clearly defined and delimited roles" and dialogic, which is "loosely structured and the roles enacted within it are fluid" (p. 133). Throughout this research, collaboration is mutable and not wholly quantifiable as its modality shifts to accommodates the participants.

[11] Collegiality is a concept holding a centerpiece this work in particular how ideas of collegiality and efficacious collaboration are a persistent riff throughout first- wave WAC narratives.

to teaching as opposed to research. Eastern Oregon State College is noted by Russell (2002) as one of the first public institutions to initiate a WAC program in lieu of requiring a writing proficiency exam to monitor undergraduate writing. Beginning in the late Seventies, Eastern Oregon State conducted optional interdisciplinary faculty workshops during the summer with the purpose of training faculty on how to include more writing in their courses (Russell, 2002). Around the same time in another part of the country, West Chester State College (now West Chester University) was experimenting with a similar workshop format, the stated primary goals of which were to instigate a "faculty attitude change" toward writing as a mode of learning (Weiss & Peich, 1980). While these two state institutions are in different geographical contexts, vary in student population (West Chester currently has an enrollment of 11,109 versus 3,032 at Eastern) and selectivity (West Chester is rated "selective" versus "less selective" for Eastern), they draw their guiding missions from similar historical backgrounds ("West Chester University," 2009). Founded with the purpose of educating women to teach elementary school, the historical progression of what were known as "normal" schools can be traced as they underwent a "metamorphosis…into teacher's colleges and eventually state universities" (Fitzgerald, 2001, p. 227). From their very inception, normal schools had a focused commitment to teaching at the core of their mission[12].

Based on pedagogical ideas from a European tradition, Fitzgerald (2001) notes the normal schools were grounded on a intellectual perspective different

[12] The Research I university, where WAC influences were not yet being felt, held its primary mission to be research instead of producing educators, which was the purview of the normal schools.

from land-grant and research universities; proto-theories of child psychology dominated their more student-centered approach. In a contemporary context, the legacy of normal school objectives explains their emphasis on teacher training and student-centered undergraduate instruction. So strongly does this idea compel West Chester's mission, today the importance of student engagement and teaching as a professional vocation is expressed in a statement of values found on the school's website: "We hold the highest esteem for teaching directed toward student learning and affirm that mastery of content as well as mastery of teaching skills necessary to communicate such content are paramount" ("WCU vision, mission & values statements," 2009). Similar sentiments can be found on the site for Eastern Oregon State, where the "personal attention" students receive is enhanced through the institution's commitment to their educational experience ("President's Homepage," 2009). As state colleges such as Eastern Oregon and West Chester sought to implement WAC initiatives with the purpose of improving student writing in the mid Seventies, a natural fit between WAC and the goals of the institution created a conducive environment for such endeavors.

However, it was not simply a greater focus on pedagogy uniting the mindset of faculty at the universities that developed from normal schools; a commitment to excellence in teaching, as opposed to research, was perceived as the benchmark of their academic careers. The difference in institutional mission between large research universities and undergraduate-oriented liberal arts colleges has a marked effect on the activities to which their respective faculties

devote their energies. Whereas faculty at a Research I university may be under a pressure to publish original material as they work toward tenure, at institutions such as West Chester and Eastern Oregon, faculty are more committed to undergraduate success as the measure of their programs. Thus, as reflected in their allotment of time, the instruction of undergraduates, as well as the many connected ancillary duties, reigns as the primary activity of faculty at colleges descended from normal schools.

This is an important distinction because the institutional setting dictates expectations for prospective faculty as well as the type of support they will receive in certain endeavors. Many faculty who attended the early WAC workshops and activities were not compensated for time spent on these projects; it was instead the faculty's desire for collegiality at their respective institutions driving participation. When the first small liberal arts colleges began to experiment with the basic features of WAC implementation, they naturally gravitated to a faculty development model suited to the collegial nature of their institutions. Russell (2002) notes how many of these early programs that "embodied most of the central features of what came to be called the writing across the curriculum movement" included a strong emphasis on faculty participation and oversight as well as the centerpiece, the interdisciplinary faculty workshop (p. 283). A bottom-up approach, where faculty, as opposed to administration, instigated the reform is another hallmark of early WAC programs. From the perspective of the instructors at private liberal arts colleges and state universities descended from normal schools, improving undergraduate education

through faculty development is a compelling enough reason for involvement. The nature of the foundational missions and the cooperative environment found at these institutions almost ensures certain initiatives, such as writing across the curriculum, will experience some success if thoughtfully implemented.

Institutional Context and Faculty Attitudes toward WAC

In first wave WAC narratives, it can be seen how the influence of institutional context shaped the way WAC first appeared via the interdisciplinary workshop and how it was then later disseminated. Oftentimes, the goals of the WAC workshop were conflated with larger notions of fostering a faculty community on the respective campuses; as noted by McLeod (1992): “the spirit of collegiality and shared purpose that develop as a result of these workshops are important outcomes, especially at institutions where faculty moral needs a boost” (p. 7). Early practices evinced three thematic elements that can be discerned as driving early WAC implementations and as having a profound effect on the choice of which methods, such as the interdisciplinary workshop, would become standard. These themes can be denoted the groundswell notion, the maximum coverage concept, and the idea of collegiality. All three are based in the idea dialogue is the key feature; in the groundswell notion one “should move quickly as possible” to “encourage dialogue” among “faculty colleagues” (p. 14) in an effort to build enthusiasm campus-wide in support of a WAC program (B. E. Walvoord, 1992). In the early stages of implementation, it has been seen as critical for success to stoke faculty interest as a means of validating WAC efforts.

While promoting dialogue and enthusiasm are not destructive practices, stressing them may be disingenuous as the high levels of interest first reached by faculty are difficult to maintain as faculty return to their respective departments and time elapses (Soven, 2001). The prevailing idea behind the groundswell notion is revealed in an early motto of the WAC movement—"Only connect"—(p. viii) stressing that the *most* important idea driving the WAC movement is whether connections are formed by those who care about student writing (Maimon, 2001). The maximum coverage concept works in concert with the groundswell notion in that for WAC to succeed, engagement must be campus wide, therefore, everyone who has a stake in its mission (who in reality is comprised by the entire campus) must be a part of the process. Like sowing seeds, WAC organizers are advised to invite not only interested faculty but also "teaching assistants, students, and others" (p. 14) in hopes that by spreading the message as widely as possible, desire for new approaches to writing will take root (B. E. Walvoord, 1992). At smaller institutions where faculty tend to be bound to a greater degree by their shared educational mission versus their individual disciplinary identities as researchers (Jablonski, 2006), notions of groundswell support and maximum coverage may in part help to facilitate a campus-wide shift toward writing across the curriculum, but their value as transmitted through the interdisciplinary workshop is questionable. The thematic elements underlying the interdisciplinary workshop as outlined here, however, are quite appealing to the better nature of faculty and therefore, ensure the continuity of the workshop as a method.

The pervading thread of collegiality is by far the most attractive; it resonates with how we as academics perceive ourselves and interactions with our colleagues. Collegiality in its ideal form examples the cooperation of colleagues from different perspectives and backgrounds; it fuels the dialogue that must occur for any changes in the curricular status quo to be made. So strongly do Magnotto and Stout believe in collegiality as underpinning the interdisciplinary workshop, they exhort "[there], the spirit of collegiality develops into a powerful force for sustaining WAC" and that "such collegial dialogue is a cornerstone of strong WAC programs" (Magnotto & Stout, 1992, p. 33). Jablonski (2006), tracing the narrative of a professor involved in WAC projects from the ground level at her small liberal arts institution, notes how "collegiality and collaboration are the thematic patterns that stand out" (Jablonski, 2006, p. 64). Maimon (2001) looks back on WAC's beginnings and envisions herself and others as "bridge builders" crossing the chasms yawning between agreement on student writing with the span of collegiality (Maimon, 2001, p. viii). The collective impression left by the first-wave WAC writings presented here is one requires only to have wide spectrum of enthusiastic, interested parties engage in collegial dialogue in an interdisciplinary workshop to succeed with a new WAC initiative. Highlighting the thematic underpinnings of the WAC interdisciplinary workshop illuminates how they were a organically occurring result of the type of institutional influences in which they found their genesis.

First Wave WAC Models in Public Institutions

As writing across the curriculum moved into public institutions, challenges were faced in making the prevailing model fit into a new mold where the major players—faculty—felt the pressure of differing motivational forces. Combining prevailing British educational theories and American expressivist traditions with an emphasis on the process of writing, Art Young and Toby Fulwiler founded the writing across the curriculum program at Michigan Technical Institute in 1977, where they utilized a "conversion narrative"[13] model to achieve the attitude change in faculty they regarded as vitally important (Russell, 2002). According to the conversion narrative, faculty can be "converted" to see the fallacious assumptions about student writing they hold with the help of understanding WAC facilitators. The euphoria of their discovery is meant to sustain the newly-converted faculty through the times when they are back in their own departments with waning enthusiasm and little support. Whereas at smaller liberal art and state colleges faculty are bound across disciplines by their similar sense of mission, faculty at larger, more departmentally disconnected institutions may need a personal reason to become involved in WAC projects, especially if WAC involvement impedes upon research opportunities. Young and Fulwiler's interdisciplinary workshop approach used missionary zeal to accomplish at a large university what collegiality facilitated at smaller colleges—serving as a compelling force that entices faculty to become involved. Young notes that for

[13] "Conversion narrative" refers to Young and Fulwiler's attempt to promote attitude change in the faculty who attend their workshops; in fact Fulwiler boldly entitled a 1986 book section "Changing Faculty Attitudes Toward Writing" (Young & Fulwiler, 1986, p. 53). For further illumination on the early WAC stance of changing faculty attitudes, see also Freisinger (1980), "Cross-Disciplinary Writing Workshops: Theory and Practice".

their program to be successful "teachers must understand that the study and teaching of language, especially writing, have the potential to empower…change" in the way students learn (Young, 1986, p.13). They provided a comfortable location where faculty were encouraged to share their own writing, as well as discuss the difficulties in teaching it, which resulted in many of them undergoing a rededication to their personal teaching mission. After faculty took part in the secluded retreat-style workshop they conducted, Young and Fulwiler "were pleased with the attitude change" (one of their primary goals) they saw in their self-report survey responses (T. Fulwiler, Gorman, M., & Gorman, M. , 1986, p. 56).

Basic elements of the WAC model developed by first-wave originators, such as the most common way of assessing WAC initiatives—self-report surveys and questionnaires—were then disseminated to other institutions, many times regardless of the differing contexts. The key components are consistent throughout many first wave WAC narratives and include "faculty development workshops" and "a faculty supervisory committee" (Russell, 2002, p. 283) with "a range of faculty colleagues from various disciplines" (B. E. Walvoord, 1992, p.14) to ensure broad-based buy in from faculty. The goals of the interdisciplinary workshop, two-fold and overlapping, were often lofty and far-reaching:

> The faculty writing workshop should change how participating teachers view writing in the curriculum. This attitude should lead, in turn, to change In how teachers assign and respond to student writing. These changes in classroom practice should produce changes in how students view writing, which, finally, should influence, in a positive way, their writing and learning abilities. (Young & Fulwiler, 1986, p. 50)

Using attitude change in faculty as an objective, however, is problematic because it relies on self-report to assess; it has no accurate baseline or apex because they differ in all who participate; its impact cannot be evaluated over time due to the multiplicity of variables and, it sets the stage for faculty resistance. The resentment of some faculty for writing across the curriculum methods has become a commonplace in WAC lore, and, in first wave narratives is presented as an obstacle to be overcome.

In fact, faculty who are resistant to WAC are painted in an unkind light throughout many first wave narratives as those who do not or will not understand the importance of what facilitators are trying to accomplish. Young and Fulwiler (1986) note that "writing workshops can't inspire or transform unmotivated, inflexible, or highly suspicious faculty members" (p. 237) with full conviction that such resistance is unwarranted. However, the antipathy within departments as WAC attempted to move into large universities reflected an institutional culture far different than the predominate contexts in which WAC was first conceived. Seeking to establish theoretical legitimacy and drawing from a mission of undergraduate education, WAC's early forays into public universities such as Michigan Tech many times espoused theories of writing and learning promoted by James Britton, which were based on his work with British school children and teens. Britton maintained that personal "expressivist" modes of writing—narratives, poetry, journals—should be included in the classroom for students to develop naturally as learners as much as "transactional" or expository writing (Russell, 2002, p. 278). Since Britton's theories were new and provocative and

ran contrary to disciplinary beliefs about how knowledge should be imparted in the classroom, early WAC practitioners such as Fulwiler and Young spent a disproportionate amount of time debating the merits of expressivist modes of writing. Lawrence Kalmbach (1986) notes how faculty voiced concern that promoting expressivist writing threatened the teaching of accepted disciplinary modes and encouraged a host of egregious writing habits, such as poor spelling, ragged sentence structure, and lack of organization (p.218). Many early attempts to coalesce WAC at large research-oriented universities were less than successful as early workshop leaders, instead of acknowledging the sites of resistance as valid, focused on selling new theories of learning to faculty. Contrary to stimulating interest, Walvoord (1992) suggests such a stance implied to instructors from disciplines outside of English they were "heathens who must be converted to the Right Way" (p.15). The themes relied upon throughout the first-wave history of WAC, in particular collegiality, and the interdisciplinary workshop as developed in the small liberal arts college did not have applicability within the disciplinarity of the large research institution where "working with traditional faculty whose view of expertise reflects the dominant institutional culture is essential" (Mahala, 1994, p. 44).

WAC and Research I Institutional Culture

In contrast to the colleges where WAC first began, research, not the teaching of undergraduates, is the primary function of faculty in large institutions. The influence of the Germanic model of the research university on American higher education since the latter half of the nineteenth century led to the deeply

entrenched disciplinarity evinced in contemporary institutions. In this environment, "discipline-based departments become the foundation of faculty allegiance" (Boyer, 1990, p. 10), presenting WAC endeavors with unique challenges as they sought to make inroads into large universities. The importance of adhering to conventions regarding disciplinary texts is emphasized in institutional departments because "written communication functions within disciplinary cultures to facilitate the multiple social interactions that are instrumental in the production of knowledge" as it is accepted within the discipline (Berkenkotter, 1995, p. 1). This effect may be underscored by a distrust of forms of writing, such as journaling, outside of disciplinary norms. While early WAC practitioners may have bemoaned their more discipline-oriented colleagues as lacking the "open mind" (T. Fulwiler, Gorman, M., & Gorman, M. , 1986, p. 237) to embrace writing across the curriculum principles, perhaps they did not fully appreciate what was at stake for disciplinary faculty. Within the culture of the research university, the department circumscribes academic life, and disciplinary identity "is centered around texts, around the literate activities of reading and writing" (Prior, 1998, p. 27). The interdisciplinary workshop, which was focused on promoting collegiality and changing faculty attitudes toward writing, gained little traction in a context where ideological differences between departments as perceived by faculty could be very real, especially as expressed through expectations of disciplinary texts.

Although early WAC proponents were focused on outcomes such as perceived positive impacts on faculty attitudes which did not have as much

relevance in the research university setting, the second wave of WAC began to move into these larger institutions. Many key components from the early programs were maintained without deeper analysis, and the ubiquitous interdisciplinary workshop was widely disseminated. Barbara Walvoord (1992), an early WAC pioneer, notes:

> Throughout the history of the WAC movement, the interdisciplinary faculty workshop has been the basis of the WAC movement, providing the yeast of understanding and commitment that leavens the curricular and programmatic elements of the WAC program. (p. 21)

Other WAC proponents concur, positing interdisciplinary workshops as “an excellent medium for change” (Magnotto & Stout, 1992, p. 32) and “the very best way” to implement a WAC program (T. Fulwiler, 1986, p. 235) especially when organized by a committed veteran faculty who has the “good connections” necessary to form interdisciplinary alliances (B. E. Walvoord, 1992, p. 16). The assumed “best fit”—i.e. the applicability and suitability of the method—of the interdisciplinary workshop model is implicit in a careful reading of early WAC narratives along with the assumption of collegiality as being the most potent motivating force. But many presumptions about writing across the curriculum in general and the interdisciplinary workshop in particular conspired to confound the expectations of those who sought to implement WAC in large research institutions.

WAC Implementation at a Large Doctoral-Granting Institution

Like other large doctoral-granting institutions, ours has also tried to provide undergraduates with a well-rounded education and realizes it in part through required core General Education courses. These courses seek to

develop students' "ability to think creatively, reason and communicate clearly" (Oklahoma, 2008), and they have been designated as "writing intensive", a common strategy used by large four-year schools to promote undergraduate writing. Courses designated as Writing Intensive (WI) and attached to a core of general education requirements are a common iteration of writing across the curriculum principles as practiced in third-wave (2000-present) implementations of WAC at larger institutions. The current Writing Program web page notes the university's policy:

> Writing should be incorporated into all general education courses. The amount of writing will vary, depending on class size and the level of support for the class. However, each course should include one or more writing components such as essay exams, graded journals, laboratory reports or term papers.(Eodice, 2007)

While writing is indeed stressed at the university, a great deal of latitude is given to the individual instructor regarding specific assignments; this is vital to maintain faculty interest in teaching WI courses. However, here, the requirement for writing was found to be fulfilled at times by the thinnest of writing assignments and with very little emphasis on the writing process. A team was formed to work in concert with instructors and address the need for students to engage in more disciplinary writing before they reached their senior capstone courses, which typically requires a substantial (20 page) research paper.

Based in the English department, staffed by doctoral students, and under the auspices of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Gen Ed[14] team was assembled to evaluate and ameliorate disciplinary writing deficiencies evinced by undergraduates in their major courses. The early part of the 2000s

[14] General Education

was devoted to involvement within departments in the humanities and met with varying degrees of success. One such department had also requested assistance with undergraduate writing and therefore was quite amenable to suggestions. The departmental faculty eventually devised their own writing-intensive prerequisite undergraduate course with the assistance of a Gen Ed team member and overall, the endeavor was considered a success because it appeared to be self sustaining. When the relationship with a department in the sciences bogged down after a semester, it was indicative of a time of transition for the Gen Ed team. In the spring of 2005, the newest team of graduate students was preparing a concerted effort to begin their involvement with a smaller science department on campus, and due to the discipline's emphasis on writing, it appeared to be promising collaboration.

Since the Gen Ed team's focus was to be primarily faculty development, the workshop method, as had been used in the past by the Gen Ed team, appeared to be the most fitting mode of deployment. The team had decided to avoid, however, the interdisciplinary workshop championed in many WAC narratives as ill suited to their desire for a deeper sense of engagement with departmental faculty. Instead, they chose to bring together like-minded faculty together from within the department to avoid the pitfall noted by Jones and Comprone (1993):

> Many WAC workshops have produced a handful of dedicated and talented faculty who are able to provide a loose collection of writing-intensive courses across the curriculum but who remain a beleaguered minority within the overall contexts of their departments and fields. (p. 59)

It was hoped by the team the intra-disciplinary workshop would help build a support system within the geography department for faculty who taught the writing intensive courses. Whereas the interdisciplinary workshop relies on collegiality to maintain a support system after the workshop is over, this cannot be assumed to occur within the research university setting. In a larger institution, a faculty member may attend an interdisciplinary workshop and "buy in" to the concepts presented there, but when back in their own department, the lack of encouragement saps their motivation for change. The Gen Ed team hoped the workshops would enhance faculty desire to support each other within the department as well as to collaborate in promoting undergraduate writing in their courses.

Although the iteration of the workshop conducted by the Gen Ed team was intra-disciplinary, the model deployed was actually quite similar to that of the interdisciplinary workshop promoted by first and second wave WAC proponents. The introduction to the Gen Ed team took place during a mandatory workshop for incoming graduate teaching assistants, who were viewed as the primary target for involvement; while faculty were peripherally involved, per the department's wishes, the workshops were be geared toward the graduate teaching assistants. The introductory session, which was held during their summer orientation, represented one of the few times the teaching assistants would all be in attendance in any session. Following a first-wave model (B. E. Walvoord, 1992) (Magnotto & Stout, 1992), the initial contact allowed the Gen Ed team to introduce themselves and the program as well as look ahead to upcoming

workshops. The orientation group was solicited on the best times for subsequent workshops and given contact information for the Gen Ed team, who believed their first interaction with the geography department to be a success.[15] The team planned their next workshop around time-tested topics and intended to focus on formulating goals and objectives upon which to construct writing assignments.

With the next workshop, the Gen Ed team knew they faced greater challenges than they had initially envisioned; even though they had tried to coordinate meeting times with the graduate students' responsibilities, many did not attend. Later the team would find attendance was in fact supposed to be mandatory, something discouraged in many WAC narratives because requiring participation can set up resistance. Magnotto and Stout (1992) note "workshop attendance should be voluntary" (p. 44), which is concurred by Fulwiler (1986) and Walvoord (1992), because doing so ensures only those who are truly invested in improving student writing will participate. Requiring the graduate students to attend neither guaranteed their participation nor built goodwill among them. Another issue peculiar to a large university and unforeseen based on early WAC narratives was the split of geography into two sub-specialties, physical and cultural. While the interdisciplinary model championed collegiality to bridge gaps *between* disciplines, those within the discipline were actually more daunting because each group thought they were really "doing" geography. The bifurcation of the department along subspecialty lines was evident in the class's self-selected seating arrangement, and attempts at group work to mix the students up

[15] Due to the tepid response the team would sometimes receive, whenever anyone showed up for a workshop and participated, it was considered to be a success.

met with resistance as well. The series of workshops planned for the semester saw subsequent attendance continue to drop off with some presentations being canceled due to inability of the teaching assistants to attend or lack of interest.

The foray provided the Gen Ed team with important experience as they continued to plan their upcoming implementations. A department in the social sciences was slated next for a multi-semester Gen Ed collaboration, and the team sought ways to increase their likelihood of success. Having initiated the endeavor, the head of the anthropology department was very supportive of the team's efforts; a plan centered around workshops and geared toward both faculty and graduate TAs was outlined for the fall of 2006. A junior faculty member was chosen to function as point person for Gen Ed team interactions and help coordinate events, such as workshops, within the department, gather course materials, and provide support to the TAs. Writing across the curriculum implementations here have traditionally relied on junior faculty who are usually already with overburdened with obligations, and planning workshops can be a daunting task. But the type of insider information these faculty members carry is crucial to understanding the atmosphere of the department for an inkling of how receptive it will be to WAC concepts. The Gen Ed team decided to distribute a questionnaire to the department in an effort to determine interest level for various iterations and themes of workshops. While Walvoord (1992) cautions against the use of surveys and questionnaires upon which to base changes, attempts were made to keep the form used by the Gen Ed team as open-ended as possible so faculty could feel free to express their thoughts about the workshops.

An overarching goal of the Gen Ed team was to foster engagement with the faculty and teaching assistants of the department with whom they were working; only with open lines of communication could the team help the department faculty to address specific situational demands. In effort to have as much information flowing to the team as possible, the director of the Gen Ed project required the department faculty involved to submit course materials to Gen Ed team members for analysis, including syllabi, writing assignments, and student papers, both graded and ungraded. This proved to be a sticking point, not only here, but with virtually every department the team worked with. Faculty were very reticent to simply hand over course materials, in particular, student papers already commented on and graded. Jablonski (2006) warns of faculty afraid of being "positioned as 'novices' or at least at least as though…'naïve' about writing" when confronted by the WAC reformer's "evangelical zeal" and their apprehension about having their own language skills appraised (p. 20). Faculty were uncomfortable in fear their own insufficiencies concerning writing and responding to it would be laid bare and perhaps even in a workshop setting. Meeting the team at the introductory workshop was still not enough to foster the type of relationship where faculty could trust the team with their written output, such as assignments and student papers, by freely submitting them for the team's perusal. Because of underlying trust issues, a thin thread of resistance ran throughout the entirety of the Gen Ed's team involvement with the last endeavor due their understandable inhibition to submit their work for appraisal. As a result, the depth of engagement the Gen Ed team members had with any

one faculty or graduate teaching assistant was limited to what could be accomplished in a typical workshop.

An introductory workshop was planned with full support from the department head and assistance from the designated junior faculty member; an email from the department head for all faculty and graduate teaching assistants “strongly encouraged” attendance at the introductory meeting. Though intra-disciplinary in nature in response to our research university setting, the workshops conducted by the Gen Ed team for the department were very similar in design to the familiar template in use since first-wave variations of WAC. As recommended by Fulwiler (1982) in his foundational first wave article “Showing, Not Telling, at the Writing Workshop” first-time workshops conducted by the team were not only introductory but exploratory in nature. The aforementioned questionnaires had been distributed to the faculty prior to the workshop to elicit what they perceived as issues needing attention in the workshop, and their answers formed the basis of the exploration. Unlike many first wave WAC narratives (Freisinger, 1980; Fulwiler, 1982; Magnotto & Stout, 1992), neither a a history of writing across the curriculum nor a background on the theories which underlie it were deemed as important ground to be covered; this may be a reflection that there is less resistance now to notions of writing to learn across the disciplines. Jablonsky (2006) notes the initial workshop is oftentimes “where WAC is first ‘sold’ to faculty” (p. 103) but in this case, although participation was more or less required by the department head, faculty and teaching assistants

alike seemed to be looking forward to a greater emphasis being placed on writing and appreciated the support of the team.

In the first workshop, the Gen Ed team introduced themselves and the articulated the team's purpose, distributed contact information, and gave an overview of scheduling in an attempt to coordinate the best times for future workshops. In past iterations with other departments, the Gen Ed team's efforts had been stymied by logistics, so a concerted effort was made to accommodate individual and departmental schedules. The team's goal at these introductory gatherings was to present a basic introduction to writing across the curriculum concepts and methods while providing groundwork for the more in-depth workshops to follow, in keeping with established workshop practices (Jablonski 2006). The workshop began with open discussion where the Gen Ed team, assisted by the survey information, helped the attendees articulate general assignment objectives, followed by an individual writing activity geared at forming the assignment criteria from those objectives. The group then reconvened for open discussion where participants examined the different criteria for their effectiveness at articulating the overall objectives for the assignment. Encompassed within this first workshop were many of the basic elements traditionally to be found in WAC workshop implementations: discussion of goals, a writing activity, and sharing of individual writing.

Desiring to keep our efforts tightly focused on the needs of departmental faculty, we administered a questionnaire to gauge the initial effectiveness of the workshop as recommended by Walvoord (1992) and Magnotto and Stout (1992)

and found the overall comments to be favorable. When asked if the workshop gave participants strategies to use when grading their students' writing, 11 out of 12 respondents said that it did;[16] a participant noted "As a grading (primarily) TA with no prior experience other than what I have learned as a student I appreciate suggestions like designing a grading rubric and how to determine understanding through student papers." Another wrote that having clearly articulated writing assignment objectives was "extremely useful" to both "the student and yourself". This participant also offered when asked for suggestions on future topics "I like group activities" and said group discussion about creating criteria was the most enjoyable workshop segment. But a downside to group discussion was noted by a participant who believed the teaching assistants were hesitant to comment on syllabi and assignment criteria from their "revered professors" again perhaps pointing to inhibitions within the department against "critiquing" or commenting on the work of one's peers.

Our initial impression upon the conclusion of the workshop was that we had conducted our first foray into a collaboration with the department successfully, and encouraged, we threw ourselves into finalizing the workshops that would enable us to finish out the semester. The upcoming workshops would be shorter than the introductory version (45 minutes versus 90) and would be geared toward specific topics of interest as determined by the questionnaires submitted at the beginning of the semester. The first topic-oriented workshop was "Teaching the Research Paper"; subsequent workshops were planned for

[16] Questionnaire responses may reflect a disproportionate number of responses from graduate teaching assistants as opposed to faculty. Real attendance of the workshop was 18, but the team believes some of the tenured faculty elected not to fill out a questionnaire.

“Teaching Student Revision” and Commenting on Student Writing” as well. Food was provided by the Gen Ed team as an incentive for all the workshops; the first featured pizza, sodas, and homemade desserts while all the following offered baked goods, such as cookies and brownies. This was not done for the previous department, and while this in no means was a future indicator of success with the department, it certainly helped incent attendance, at least initially. The subsequent workshops were also offered multiple times in an effort to fit the schedule of everyone who wanted to participate with the Gen Ed team members working tag-team to cover various timeslots. To accommodate different learning/teaching styles, Gen Ed team members also were available to attend classes and office hours with instructors to provide writing assignment back up. During the entirety of our involvement with this department, the Gen Ed team was acutely aware of potential points of resistance and did everything possible to alleviate any unease felt by the faculty or teaching assistants. This is reflected in the heavy reliance on participant feedback to shape the involvement, offering broad availability, and tailoring offerings based on the desire of the department. The team’s aim was to build an ethos of credibility with the department so their collaborative relationship could move to a deeper level of engagement.

The Gen Ed team’s involvement with this department spanned two semesters, and over time attendance at the workshops dropped markedly. The second tier of workshops was never attended by more than a half dozen people at any session, and by the middle of the second semester, people simply stopped showing up. In spite of the efforts made by the Gen Ed team to be

flexible, accommodating and supportive, their relationship with the department never came to fruition in the form of collaborative efforts. Fulwiler and Young (1986) held their three-day faculty writing across the curriculum workshop in the deep woods of Michigan, where sequestered from workaday distractions, participants became co-collaborators in a low-stakes context. However, the Gen Ed team faced the challenge of trying to build a relationship centered around writing with an entire academic department, including senior faculty, tenure-track, and teaching assistants. Early WAC narratives presented 1-3 day workshops where participants had some time to form "relationships" before drafting assignments individually and then evaluating their writings together; it was the thread of collegiality that served to tie early WAC efforts together. Collegiality helped to ameliorate the risk associated with sharing one's writings or as an instructor allowing one's materials to be subject to scrutiny. But in the environment of the large research institution disciplinarity and ranking (e.g. teaching assistant, assistant professor, tenured faculty) are also hugely compelling forces and turn what to outsiders is a low-risk activity (e.g. sharing syllabi and course materials) into a high-stakes venture. Bringing in models, such as workshops, developed within other contexts does not guarantee a "best fit" solution. Soven (1992) cites a summary of writing program innovations gone awry and notes "the cause of failure was imagining that ideas that work well at one institution can be transported to another without considerable attention to the substructures in place" at the first institution (p. 195). The Gen Ed team had been trying to recreate the traditional writing across the curriculum workshop in a

completely different setting and in doing so had overlooked the realities of fostering engagement under different circumstances than depicted in first wave WAC narratives.

It seemed key to our WAC endeavor to establish the roots of strong collaborative relationships that could withstand the institutional vicissitudes at a large doctoral-granting university, such as departmental isolation, the lack of a support system, and the heavy demands placed on time by research. The workshop model provides a conducive atmosphere for forming collaborations at small liberal arts colleges similar to those where the first WAC programs saw their genesis because it is well suited to collegial interdisciplinary workshops based on a groundswell of support. However, larger institutions need a different conception of writing across the curriculum and one that is responsive to their unique needs. They need an implementation providing ongoing support delivered responsively to faculty and tailored to the unique needs of each department and discipline. WAC programs at large universities are faced with the challenge of developing more than merely a superficial engagement with faculty because the motivation provided by workshops, while well-intentioned and temporarily helpful, fades without reinforcement. The demands of scholarly research also insist upon deep engagement if a faculty member is to become involved in a WAC endeavor; when time is at a premium, close collaborations permit maximum productivity. Finally, collaborative relationships permit trust to develop allowing for frank discussions about course goals, construction of assignments, and responding to student writing. With a new writing center

director now coordinating the WAC effort, the Gen Ed team, now known as writing fellows, prepared for a shift in focus, one that would rely less on the workshop and more on the collaboration of individual participants.

Chapter 3

Affecting Change One-to-One: Early Models of Writing Fellows' Work

In the preceding chapter, the development of the WAC interdisciplinary workshop was traced, and it was shown how its methods were shaped by the very unique institutional, professional, and social contexts of the time. But, as noted by Soven (2001), "writing across the curriculum is undergoing a transformation" and "the faculty workshop that used to be the mainstay of WAC no longer exists at many institutions" (p. 200). While many smaller colleges and universities have seen success with WAC implementations featuring the interdisciplinary workshop, larger Research I and doctoral-granting institutions like ours have still struggled with effective methods for utilizing WAC that evince a sensitivity for working within highly specialized disciplines. This chapter addresses the unique requirements such universities have of WAC programs and how one-to-one, as opposed to workshop, models have proven to be successful. As evinced here this may be due to the on-to-one consultation model's adaptability; the various iterations presented here include student-to-student, instructor-to-instructor, and non-hierarchical collaboration in diverse forms. The writing fellows model as used here is grounded theoretically in composition process and writing center collaborative theories.

Process pedagogy and other methods from the composition classroom, such as small group interaction and peer review, have been perceived as helping to build a stronger bridge between freshman composition and the writing

performed by students for their major course work. The development of approaches using constructivism in the 1970s was the genesis of a WAC implementation that relies on one-to-one contact to guide students through the demands of writing for a particular course; these social constructivist theories of learning promoted the idea of students working with peers to create new knowledge. Harriet Sheridan, influential educator and dean at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota, is often credited for her early experimentation with 'rhetoric fellows'—undergraduate trained to provide help for students taking courses with the Writing Intensive (WI) designation (Maimon, 1992, p. vii). When Sheridan relocated to Brown University in 1979, she "moved quickly to establish the well-known Brown Writing Fellows program, which she had already conceptualized and implemented at Carleton" (Maimon, 1992, p. vii). The principles which Sheridan's program emphasized, such as collaboration in a non-hierarchical setting and reaching solutions via intellectual exchange, were consonant with the newly articulated goals of writing across curriculum initiatives already in place at a few small liberal arts colleges. These early writing fellows programs were implemented using undergraduate student tutors, and the assistance given was most often connected to a specific course and geared toward the enrolled students.

In 1980, Tori Haring-Smith was brought on board to initiate the Writing Fellows program at Brown University and in exploratory faculty workshops fielded the usual complaints from her new colleagues about students' lack of writing ability (Haring-Smith, 1992). After appraising the situation and establishing base-

level support throughout the university, Haring-Smith instituted a program where undergraduate student tutors were delegated to a pre-designated WI course at the ratio of one fellow per fifteen students. The fellows were self-selected from a variety of disciplines, then evaluated, trained (a one-semester, three-credit-hour course was mandatory), and assigned to a more experienced "head fellow" who functioned as the leader and faculty contact person for their course involvement (p. 124). Students submitted rough drafts to their designated fellow, who commented with questions and feedback; the head fellows would troubleshoot and assist as needed. Drafts with writing fellow comments were then returned to the students, who would use this information to revise their papers and resubmit along with their initial commented draft, this time to the professor. With this method, the instructor was privy to the comments made by the fellow and the resultant revision performed by the student. The goals of the writing fellows involvement were:

- To demonstrate that all faculty and students share responsibility for student writing
- To explore ways in which writing and learning are connected
- To change both student and faculty attitude toward writing
- To make writing an integral part of the curriculum, not feature of isolated courses
- To encourage students to practice good writing habits, including revision
- To involve all students, not just the weak writers
- To reward faculty for their attention to student writing
- To provide students with feedback for revision before their writing is judged and graded (Haring-Smith, 1992, pp., p. 177)

The objectives set for Brown's Writing Fellows program represent the co-existing motivations that underlie WAC programs: to provide support for students

in producing better disciplinary writing and to influence pedagogical methods by working with faculty.

The writing fellows model has been successfully used to assist students with writing for specific courses; in these implementations, writing fellows act as a “rhetorical bridge” between the students and the instructor (Mullin & Schorn, 2007, p. 9). For the instructor, disciplinary writing may have become transparent, i.e. creating disciplinary prose has become almost a reflexive act; Russell (2002) points out how faculty, well-versed in “the interactional rules, tacit and explicit” of their own disciplinary community, are stymied when attempting to teach disciplinary writing conventions to neophyte student writers (p. 14). In addition students and instructor may not have a common vocabulary to discuss writing; a writing fellow with a background in writing foremost over content knowledge facilitates a middle ground where dialogue can occur. Often times, expectations for assignments can be misinterpreted, and an outside party in the form of a writing fellow may articulate to students what an instructor is looking for. Or conversely, if a large number of students are having difficulty with a writing task, the writing fellow can serve as a liaison and bring it to the instructor’s attention; the fellow’s feedback may motivate the instructor to modify the assignment. As discussed thus far, writing fellows, also known as “mentors” (Mullin & Schorn, 2007), “peer-tutors”, and “curriculum-based peer tutors” (Bazerman, 2005, p. 110) work predominately with students, provide ancillary support for the instructors, and serve as facilitators of open dialogue between professors and their classes.

Contemporary Writing Fellows Implementations

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a writing fellows program is currently in place that closely replicates the original iteration conceived of by Haring-Smith at Brown in the 1980s. As opposed to the casual support network relied upon by Haring-Smith, however, today's writing programs, such as that at UW, have their own websites with many avenues for faculty and potential fellows to access writing information. The ideology underlying the UW program is explicitly stated on the site:

> Two central beliefs guide this program. The first is that all writers, no matter how accomplished, can improve their writing by sharing work in progress and making revisions based on constructive criticism; the second is that collaboration among student peers is an especially effective mode of learning. ("About the Program," 2009)

When compared to the purported goals of the Brown program, circa 1992, it may be deduced that, after deploying writing fellows for a number of years, contemporary programs, such as UW, have fine-tuned their aims. Gone are objectives aimed at faculty, such as evincing a stake in student writing for faculty and rewarding their attention, or those hard to quantify or perhaps not directly a concern of the program, for instance, as the title of Haring-Smith's (1992) article alludes, "changing student attitudes" about writing. As is becoming more typical in long-standing WAC programs, resources are directed prudently at each of the many facets of implementation; it becomes clear after perusing the website and conversing with faculty, UW's writing fellows program (and others based on the Brown model, such as Michigan, Harvard, Swarthmore, and Penn) targets primarily students as the recipients of their services, with both students and

faculty reaping benefits. Co-collaborator is more indicative of the writing fellows relationship between students as opposed to with the faculty member, who tends to view fellows in a peer tutor capacity.

Ankur Desai, an assistant professor who teaches in the Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences Department at UW, is currently a participant in the Writing Fellows program there. He finds it particularly appropriate for his course "Global Change: Atmospheric Issues and Problems", which requires students to demonstrate critical thinking and research skills via written assignments. Dr. Desai points to very specific reasons as to why he incorporates writing assignments into this course:

> My philosophy in this course, is that given that most students are not future AOS or earth system majors, my primary goal should be to help students, future leaders and decision makers, become better and more critical consumers of scientific reports and media, especially those related to earth systems science and atmospheric issues (climate change, air quality, etc...). Writing and critical analysis of scientific documents, popular texts on science, media reporting on science, policy partially dependent on scientific claims, and self-reflection on personal behavior reaction to scientific claims (e.g., carbon footprints) are thus key to contextualizing the concepts of 1.) how do earth systems behave and 2.) and how do we gain scientific knowledge about this that is relevant to society? (Desai, 2009)

Dr. Desai emphasizes that the course is populated by predominantly non-majors, making his task of acclimating them to analyzing scientific discourse an even greater challenge. Through course materials, such as syllabi and assignment sheets, and using verbiage outlined in the *The Writing Fellows Faculty Handbook,* Dr. Desai articulates his expectations for his students and their relationship with the writing fellow in a manner drawn almost verbatim from the original program at Brown. He makes strenuous efforts to make the writing

fellows an integral part of the course and has a strong investment in the outcome of the intellectual relationships that are formed. Dr. Desai also takes an interest in mentoring the writing fellows assigned to his course and notes he goes well beyond the "mandated requirements" of the relationship: "I like to involve the fellows in every step of the assessment process from design of the assignment, construction of the grading rubric, evaluation of drafts and revision process, and post-grading recap" (Desai, 2009). While there is no doubt the students enrolled in Atmospheric and Oceanic Science 171, as well as the writing fellows connected with the course, reap tremendous benefits from their involvement, the positives for Ankur Desai seem more difficult to articulate. The professor seems to enjoy his writing fellows participation and indeed places great emphasis on the importance of writing fostering an improvement in students' critical and analytical skills; he would be the perfect candidate for future inclusion in a faculty development model of WAC.

WAC, Faculty Development, and the One-to-One Relationship

Thus far, the writing fellows implementation discussed has been the iteration conceptualized by Sheridan in the late 1970s, which in spite of the broad nature of its goals, focused on providing one-on-one assistance to students linked with a specific writing-intensive course. Using methodology derived from process pedagogy—revision—and social constructivism—peer-tutoring, the undergraduate student-as-tutor fills this role very well. But when another near-ubiquitous element of WAC implementation, faculty development, is considered, this manifestation of writing fellows strictly bypasses it in favor of working of the

“student” aspect of student writing. It remains doubtful, however, that participation in such programs as the aforementioned would “change…faculty attitudes toward writing” (Haring-Smith, 1992, p. 124); though they probably would, however, be a welcome addition to a classroom that already incorporates significant attention being paid to writing. The Writing Fellows website at UW notes that benefits to faculty utilizing the program include less time spent grading and being able to focus more on content because the fellows have addressed the more mechanical issues present in student papers; this aspect is corroborated by Dr. Desai. However, instead of challenging the way faculty perceives disciplinary writing, the rhetoric of the UW Writing Fellows program website (and accompanying Faculty Handbook) reinforces the form/content binary expressly rejected by social constructivist pedagogy. Hierarchical and paternalistic, as opposed to collaborative, relationships are at the heart of the program; faculty are reminded to “keep the lines of communication open” for their “not yet fully developed” writing fellows and to provide “guidance, support, and consideration” (Program, 2005, p. 4). In many colleges and universities, the writing fellows’ role in the relationship is defined in a similar manner, with the program being centered around peer tutors who are subordinate to the course instructors.

However, although it may or may not go under the moniker of “writing fellows” such as the University of Oklahoma, similar conceptualizations of this methodology exist, only geared toward the faculty development aspect of WAC. Some programs deploy writing fellows to form relationships with *faculty* linked to a specific course; for example, if working mainly as a faculty resource, the writing

fellows may or may not work with students on extensive revision of drafts, but would focus on the way the faculty member responds to drafts. A contemporary of Haring-Smith, Peche Kuriloff (1992) outlines an early version of this type of WAC/ writing fellows relationship, one between "writing consultants and non-writing teachers" where co-collaborators engage in activities such as course design and team teaching (p. 94). The underlying assumption of Kuriloff's model is that there is a significant difference in content knowledge between the "writing expert" (p. 94) and the content area specialist who teaches the course, and each one must "educate" (p. 98) the other to the ways of their own unique discourse community. In the Kuriloff scenario, the writing expert is an English instructor, possibly the WAC director, who works with the faculty assigned the course as a co-teacher; the expectation that course responsibilities need to be equitably split is made very clear. It is not hard to imagine that this had the potential to cause strife because collaborative relationships are not always encouraged in the competitive and highly specialized atmosphere of the academy, and institutions have been slow to give recognition to such efforts.

Unlike the writing fellows model originated at Brown, this manifestation calls for collaboration between colleagues with approximately the same level of expertise and institutional stature—neither assumes a subordinate role. Rather emphasis is placed on the two participants providing insight into their own discourse communities and sharing the motivations behind their pedagogical choices. This adds an extra element to complicate collaboration if maintaining professional identities blocks deeper engagement, e.g. participants may hesitate

to appear vulnerable or ignorant by admitting where their knowledge gaps lie. Also, in comparison to the rigorous screening process carried out for undergraduate tutors, happenstance seems to determine the success of team teaching relationships, as noted here by Kuriloff (1992):

> Probably the most important issue in team teaching is compatibility, which enables the team to establish common goals. To work effectively together, both instructors must feel secure and each must respect and value the other's expertise. The process of designing the course and setting goals offers a reasonable test of compatibility. If possible, it's a good idea to withhold a decision about team teaching until the design process is near completion. The specific arrangement you work out will depend a great deal on what you learn about each other as you gain experience working together. (p. 102)

In the excerpt quoted here, a weakness in the model is that ideas of "collaboration" are enmeshed with notions of "compatibility" and personal identity; this skews the goals of the team toward notions of collegiality as opposed to overall productivity. Harkening back to WACs beginnings at small liberal arts colleges, Kuriloff expresses a longing for a less specialized institution and hopes for a time when collaborative efforts, such as team teaching, "bring us closer to our goal of creating a community of readers and writers that reaches across disciplines" (p. 104).

Contemporary Iterations of Faculty Writing Consultancy

Current WAC programs have the benefit of learning from those who have been deploying WAC at institutions around the country for almost thirty years, allowing them to experiment with methodologies that have already been tested and chose those most appropriate for their institutional context. At Pace University, a writing consultancy has been implemented in conjunction with their

WAC/WEC (Writing Enhanced Course) program that incorporates many of the methods discussed throughout this work. The model piloted at Pace is based on WE (or Writing Intensive) courses, supplemented by faculty workshops at regular intervals throughout the semester, and includes the use of writing consultants working with faculty on specific courses. The WE courses share many of the standard features seen in these types of curricula; Martha Townsend (2001) notes "despite the variations in language…the guidelines for WI [and WE] courses at most institutions is surprisingly similar" (p. 234). These include "courses …capped at 30 and an average of 30-50% of the grade… based on writing evaluation" (Anstendig, 2001, October 8); this is also comparable to the standards set for the student peer-tutor assisted Writing Intensive courses at the University of Wisconsin-Madison discussed earlier. In addition to the WE courses represented across the curriculum, changes were also made to the writing requirement, adding a semester of Writing in the Disciplines (offered by English) and including a junior or senior level research and writing course within students' disciplines. While some would argue that requiring WI or WE courses serves to mark writing as being segregated from other learning activities (a notion profoundly contrary to WAC ideology) proponents posit "the WI course requirement …has served as a powerful vehicle for expanding attention to student writing as well as faculty development" (Townsend, 2001, p. 240). For Pace University, the WE requirement provided a way for the institution to focus its goals for student writing and articulate them clearly.

The WE courses also helped to identify interested instructors and draw them into workshop settings where they would be introduced to WAC concepts. For their pilot study, WAC program directors at Pace developed interdisciplinary workshops serving approximately 10-14 faculty that were interspersed at crucial junctures throughout the academic semester and served to provide support to faculty participating in the WE program as well as means for tracking individual progress. The authors trace the course of the workshops as follows:

> The first workshop, either face to face on each campus or as a video conference between campuses, was often held before the WEC semester began so that the writing consultants could work with professors to prepare the syllabus for the course. In a second workshop, usually in mid-semester, professors gave progress reports and demonstrated revision and evaluation strategies. A third workshop was offered in the pilot stage as a taped video-conference of the reports from each professor and writing consultant. (Anstendig, 2001, October 8)

Accompanying the workshops instructors were introduced to their writing consultants, consisting of "two full-time English professors with excellent writing expertise and two very experienced part-time English professors" for the over one dozen faculty (Anstendig, 2001, October 8). The workshops were reduced to just two since the 2001 pilot and discipline-specific workshops are now offered to fill the gap; this reflects a trend toward more judicious use of resources because, as has been seen, the lasting effectiveness of interdisciplinary workshops may be suspect. In keeping with programmatic tendencies toward greatest cost-benefit ratio, writing consultants utilized in conjunction with workshops and geared around a WE course requirement, may represent a productive means to sustain WAC programs that chose to focus on the faculty development model of WAC.

Another important aspect of the deployment of WAC writing consultancy at UW was that it was accompanied by the opening of a writing center with tenure-track director and full-time coordinator at other campus locations serving as the base of operations and point of contact for faculty. The writing center is a natural fit as anchor for WAC endeavors; Joan Mullin (2001) notes the potential for "effective partnerships" between the two to be maintained. In fact, all the universities mentioned thus far in this work, including ours, have their writing across the curriculum initiatives based out of their writing centers, providing a physical and institutional entity to "an interdisciplinary effort with no home" (McLeod & Miralglia, 2001, p. 15). At UW the writing center serves as a portal for the Writing Fellows and Writing Across the Curriculum programs literally as well as through their website where is possible to access "hundreds of pages" of information for faculty on how to prepare better writing assignments, implementing peer review, responding to student writing etc. (Writing, 2008). The writing center website also links faculty to resources created to provide one-to-one support similar both to the implementation at Pace and that which was outlined by Kuriloff. A faculty member can tailor their level of involvement, from printing out online materials to assistance in composing writing assignments, or if desired, even team teaching opportunities, depending on their comfortability level. The writing center provides a focal point as well easy access to an plethora of writing services serving students and faculty, but more germane to a discussion about writing across the curriculum is the ideological base it provides for one-to-one methods and learning community concepts .

WAC and the Writing Center: Shared Ideologies

Looking back at the early history of the writing center and how it was couched in post-World War II remedial instruction, it is hard to fathom its metamorphosis from a fix-it lab to a center for writers strategically positioned to address contemporary campus-wide writing concerns. However, as noted by McLeod and Miraglia (2001), “the history of writing centers in U.S. higher education parallels the history of WAC programs”, which in turn was closely linked to the development of composition as a discipline (p. 7). In a booming post-war America the proliferation of jobs requiring workers with sufficient writing skills far outstripped the abilities of universities to adequately fill them; the exigency of the situation required remedial assistance be given to preparing students to meet these demands. Students were often required to visit the writing lab, where the focus was on skills and drills and overall mechanical correctness, though at places such as the University of Iowa, a one-to-one pedagogy was developing. Throughout the 1950s and into the 1960s the model of the remedial writing lab held sway as universities and colleges maintained the status quo, a luxury they were allowed since the push toward two-year community colleges had siphoned off many of the what are now known as non-traditional students. Enrollment standards were high, as were expectations of students, so the methods of writing instruction in place, often a mandatory composition course or two augmented by remedial instruction, served the system.

The ensuing years, however, saw those who taught writing look to further establish themselves in the university, and as composition continued to develop, scholars looked to other disciplines, such as psychology, to develop pedagogical theory. The cognitivist[17] movement in psychology influenced and served to help deepen a theoretical base for the discipline of composition during this time but was also partially responsible for some writing centers' dubious move toward a more "auto-tutorial" model (Boquet, 1999). The labs featured individual student workstations outfitted with technology, which "had significant implications for marriage of site and method" because it created a distinct campus and institutional location for individual writers working with writing (Boquet, 1999) (p. 51). The writing center was evolving as a site but still needed an identity to replace that of the remedial clinic or fix-it lab, and the time for assuming it was imminent. The 1970s and open admission policies forced administrators to consider new curricular directions as colleges and universities across the country dealt with with classrooms filled with a new type of college student: working class, minority, female, and/or first generation. Institutions offered writing instruction that had served the status quo since World War II, but it now seemed unresponsive to the needs of the new wave of students.

[17] The influence of cognitivism in composition theory can be traced to Linda Flowers whose 1979 *College English* article "Writer-Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing" suggested inventions at the process level of writers because "it taps intuitive communication strategies writers already have, but are not adequately using" (p. 20). Andrea Lunsford (1979) in "Cognitive Development and the Basic Writer" posits basic writers "have not attained that level of cognitive development which would allow them to form abstractions or conceptions" (p. 275). The suggestion is that basic writers are equipped with everything they need structurally to perform writing tasks, they are only lacking in cognitive development. This assumes an immutable developmental path is followed by all writers in a linear fashion. Linearity is another criticism of Flowers later work with John Hayes "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing" (1981) which presents the writing process as a flow chart with no possibility for recursion; this model was discredited as an impractical theory soon after its publication (See Bizzell,1982; Faigley, 1986; Brand,1987)

A Theoretical Watershed: Writing Instruction Comes Into Its Own

Attending college was becoming a “right” of every American citizen; this belief was made visible through the success of open admissions policies. Paradoxically, the Germanic research university model many institutions were patterned on did not seem to have the ability to logistically deal with the education of so many undergraduates. Writing instruction had reached a crucial juncture, and it seemed both traditional and non- traditional students alike were having difficulty acclimating to academic writing. Different strategies, such as tutoring and counseling programs sponsored by the university and staffed by graduate students showed little, if any, effect (Bruffee, 1984). Kenneth Bruffee notes the lack of effect such initiatives had and points out “one symptom of the difficulty these students had adapting to college life and work was that many refused help when it was offered” (Bruffee, 1984, p. 637). Perhaps, he posited, students were shying away from institutional remedial structures because “the kind of help provided seemed mainly an extension of the work, the expectations, and above all the social structure of traditional classroom learning” (p. 637). In struggling for a way to reach these students, Bruffee hit upon a method—basically a variation of the writing lab one-to-one model—using tutoring performed by peers instead of a more knowledgeable grad student or faculty member. The notion of peer tutoring revolutionized writing center work and writing instruction through its intimation of a new underlying theoretical thread. What Bruffee was developing in his early experiments at Brooklyn College and through his writings was a theory of social constructivism.

Social contructivism has exerted considerable pressure on current-traditional modes of instruction that ascertain the existence of an objective truth "out there" waiting to be discovered. However, as formulated by the theory of constructivism there is no objective truth, but various "truths" that are validated by the multi-various discourse communities who hold them to be so. Berlin (1987) summarizes the social constructivist stance as "a conception of knowledge as a social construction—a dialectical interplay of investigator, discourse community, and material world, with language as the agent of mediation" (pp. 175-76). New theories in psychology, sociology, and human development exerting their influence in academe corroborated this social aspect of intellectual growth. The work of Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky enjoyed a resurgence in stature owed to the rise of social constructivism and is considered one of its theoretical influences. It is worth noting that:

> Language and speech occupy a special place in Vygotsky's psychological system because they play a double role. On the one hand, they are a psychological tool that helps to form other mental functions; on the other hand, they are one of these functions, which means that they also undergo a cultural development.(Kozulin, 1986, p. xxx)

In essence, this indicates that any developments that are affected in language and speech cannot be obtained in a cultural vacuum; culture and community find meaning in language and speech as well as vice versa.

Another element of Vygotsky's work that was instrumental in influencing pedagogical methods was his articulation of the *zone of proximal development.* He found that when measuring children's development, a problem that was given to child to solve without assistance was only measuring what the child had

successfully learned to that point, or his or her completed development. However, these measures failed to evaluate what the child was capable of accomplishing with assistance, which many times would indicate a mental age that surpassed their actual age. Therefore, “the discrepancy between a child’s actual mental age and the level he (*sic*) reaches in solving problems with assistance indicates the zone of his proximal development” (Vygotsky, 1986, p. 187). The zone of proximal development (ZPD) indicates the potential for learning beyond what has already been apprehended, but it is unreachable through individual effort. A mentor, in Vygotsky’s research, a parent, or even a knowledgeable peer can provide the support a learner needs to scaffold them to the next level of learning. In the writing process, according to models of social constructivism, dialogue sustains the author through their ZPD because meaning is made through interacting with others in a discourse community (which can loosely be described as a group sharing common goals and using similar indentifying language mechanisms to assert membership). Bruffee (1984) posits “what the work of Vygotsky and others has shown…[is] that reflective thought is public or private conversation internalized” (p. 639). Communities of knowledgeable peers help to fill gaps in student understanding and push students beyond that initial encounter to integrating new knowledge into their daily schema. The meaning exists in the many conversations one has every day, and according to the theories of social constructivism, provides the basis for the individual knowledge one creates.

Social constructionist theories evolved from and resonated perfectly with the cultural mood of the early to mid 1970s, and they also were the foundation for a pedagogical approach that would become a mainstay in many writing centers and college composition classrooms. Many, if not the majority of writing centers would eventually be staffed in part by undergraduate peer tutors, and small group work and peer review would become commonplace activities for the first-year composition student. It is of very little surprise the writing across the curriculum movement also began to gain ground at small and private liberal arts colleges across the country at this time for they share an ideological home. Mullin (2001) observes:

> While there never was a single evolutionary line that both writing centers and WAC programs followed, their mutual philosophies began to develop mutual theories and practices. These created a context for…programs that transverse disciplinary lines and challenge traditional thinking about writing and learning content in a world in which writing and learning contexts change. (p. 183)

And with the development of more WAC programs, writing curricula became more sophisticated, compelling the creation of writing centers where none previously existed to help students keep up with the writing demands of their courses. At their foundation they both shared the theories of social constructivism that would stand as a response to objectivist pursuits of knowledge, which had served as the bedrock for the current-traditional mode of education.

Social Constructivism and Changes in Practice

As collaboration as a method was being deployed to promote student engagement and learning in writing centers and composition classes, academics were still debating its significance for endeavors regarding their own professional writing. Collaboration between co-authors, while used in the medical and hard sciences extensively, was being newly considered in the humanities, long a bastion of self-realized intellect. One of composition's earliest practitioners of the collaborative method, Andrea Lunsford (1991) points out:

> Collaboration both in theory and practice, represents an epistemological shift, a shift in the way we view knowledge. This shift involves a move from viewing knowledge and reality as things exterior to or outside of us, as immediately accessible, individually knowable, measurable, and sharable—to viewing knowledge and reality as mediated by or constructed through language in social use, as socially constructed, contextualized, as, in short, the product of *collaboration*. (p. 93)

Lunsford extended the social constructivist aim to to academic writing collaborations, arguing that such enterprises have the potential to "challenge… traditional power relationships" that underscore institutional politics because they expose their socially-constructed roots (Ede & Lunsford, 1990, p. 120). Collaborative projects also have the potential to increase the expertise of each member outside of their prior boundaries because the resultant work is far greater than the sum of its parts. While within the discipline of composition and practice of WAC and writing centers, collaborative writing is valorized for its potential to reshape *student* learning as well as the communities in which it takes place, that esteem is not reflected unilaterally across the academy for faculty endeavors. Kami Day and Michele Eodice (Day & Eodice, 2001) note many

humanities academics they interviewed for their book, (*First Person)²: A Study of Co-Authoring in the Academy,* felt that while their professional journals contained many co-authored articles, only single-authored work would be counted toward tenure considerations, a reality noted by Ede and Lunsford when they looked at collaboration in their own co-written 1990 work, *Singular Texts/Plural Authors*. Tensions inherent in academic collaboration forced early WAC practitioners to rely on collegiality, or the good will of their colleagues to participate in WAC endeavors because true collaborative ventures would have been looked at askance. This type of "commonsense" collaboration is marked by what Jablonski (2006) notes as an "*invisible* dimension of interpersonal relationships", and when successful, is comprised of "an appropriate mix of personality types, work habits, and matching levels of individual motivation" (p. 32). Collaborative relationships built around the commonsense model have driven WAC initiatives since their inception, but like the oft-deployed interdisciplinary workshop, have not been fully interrogated.

Formalized Collaboration: Writing Consultancy

The collaborative model, first exemplified through the peer or writing center tutor, has the potential to be applied with lasting effectiveness to the faculty development aspect of WAC. Jones and Comprone (1993) argue, "permanent success" in WAC collaborations is contingent on "creating a curricular and pedagogical dialogue that is based on and reinforced by research" to counteract a tendency to rely on the chance nature of collegial relationships (p. 61). Integral to the positive implementation of this type of collaborative praxis is

to attempt to define the roles of the relationship's key members as sharply as possible; this is an easier task when the co-collaborators are self-selected and predisposed to bring a mutual understanding to the table. However, in many larger institutions where collaboration takes place within a broader programmatic framework, the selection of co-collaborators is usually decided by the program head, and as noted by Jablonski (2006), Walvoord (1996), and Kuriloff (1992) an uncomplicated partnership is not always guaranteed. For the endeavor to succeed, analyzing typical scenarios to develop theoretical models can help the members of the collaborative partnership as they attempt to forge an understanding about methods and goals.

Before undertaking WAC initiatives where one-to-one collaborations with disciplinary faulty are the primary method of implementation, an attempt should be made to quantify the relationships to discourage attributing their success or failure to collegiality or lack thereof. If the on-to-one consultancy model is to be utilized in broad application and its features to be generalizable across contexts, its dynamics demand to be theorized. Jablonski (2006), who looks at a various forms of one-to-one collaborative WAC activities, like Kuriloff (1992) prefers "consultancy" to describe collaboration that is "more formal, and to a degree, more institutionally sanctioned" (p. 36). In WAC consultancy relationships, the overt goals are fairly consonant across the board in their purview and usually geared toward assisting faculty with better assignment design, incorporating more revision opportunities, responding to student writing, etc. However, the implicit and underlying objective of writing across the curriculum endeavors is to

“modify [faculty] assumptions about writing” (Jablonski, 2006, p. 36). The writing consultant’s first and most immediate goal of this partnership is providing guidance and support to a faculty partner implementing writing in their classroom; the meta goal of achieving an epistemological shift in faculty that produces lasting pedagogical change is hoped for but not guaranteed by the parameters of the relationship.

Goals: Whose Are They and How Do They Drive the Consultancy Relationship?

The “service model” (Jablonski, 2006) portrays one-to-one writing experts working with a faculty partner and holds tantamount the instructor’s goals for the collaboration, which again resonates with a business consultancy framework. Within this model, an instructor is the “buyer” for the writing consultant’s “services” with the understanding that the consumer of the services, the faculty member, may use the provided information however they see fit (Jablonski, 2006, pp. 105-106). It is important to note that in this scenario, the buyer, or faculty member, determines the need. A service model iteration of consultancy is so common, it appears to more accurately be described on a continuum of WAC relationship development, i.e. when perceived through the lens of the meta goals of WAC involvement, the service model, as coined by Jablonsky, actually represents the base level of faculty “buy in.” In business, the buyer may be able to most accurately assess their own need because they know the context better

than the consultant; in kind, a faculty member believes they have the ability to gauge what assistance they need to achieve their goals for the course.

It is assumed if the professor self-selected for WAC involvements or to teach a WI-designated course, their goals are in line with WAC programmatic goals and centered around basic tenets of writing process pedagogy, assignment design, and offering feedback. If the faculty member evinces signs of internalizing WAC pedagogy, utilizes WAC methods, and implements new course design, it would be in most cases considered a success. A writing consultant at Pace University reports how her faculty partner, a business professor, seemed to integrate WAC concepts thoroughly:

> After attending the introductory meeting at the start of the semester, he went home and completely revamped his class…He required his students to write, in stages, a twenty-five page report on a company,…mandated peer response…collected drafts of essay, made written comments, and then returned the papers for revision…[and] he used an assessment rubric that I had sent him. (Anstendig, 2001, October 8)

By many standards, the above account may represent a best case scenario for an initial engagement, as the faculty member seems to have successfully adopted WAC pedagogical strategies. While some may argue that consultancy relationships in the service model may reinforce form/content binaries or “result in little to no significant changes on the part of faculty or departmental attitudes, assumptions and practices” (Jablonski, 2006, p. 105), such instances are better viewed as a point on a continuum toward the long-term meta goal.

The writing consultant holds dual sets of goals for the co-collaboration. The first set of goals are those reflected in the aforementioned narrative about the business professor at Pace University and represent practical, classroom-level WAC goals. These goals are focused mainly on classroom pedagogy and attached closely to student activities like peer review and revision. But WAC initiatives seek to have a more lasting impact on classroom practices via influencing instructors' epistemological notions about writing and learning; overall, the "writing consultant should help faculty understand the processes implicit in their writing activities" (Jablonski, 2006, p. 116). Instructors cannot recognize the gaps in their own understanding, so the service model approach alone will not bring about long-term change. Writing consultants need to recognize the learning curve of WAC ideology in faculty and not expect deeply-held attitudes to change immediately because the meta goals of writing consultancy are long term. The Pace consultant was more focused on her *meta goals* for the WAC partnership than the equally important immediate, local, classroom goals the business professor understandably gravitated toward:

> Although I was pleased that the Business professor had so completely absorbed WEC strategies and methods, and that he had so thoroughly revised his class, I felt left out of the process. Rather than consulting with me on a regular basis, he made all the changes in his approach based on his reading of the WEC materials that he had received at that first meeting or by mail from me. He rarely responded to my email and phone messages asking to meet, he never sent me his syllabus or any updates on his successes or problems, and we never met again until the end-of-term assessment workshop, at which point we discovered what he had been doing during the semester. What, I wondered, had I done wrong? (Anstendig, 2001, October 8)

It soon becomes evident that to effectively assess a writing consultancy relationship, goals must be categorically separated, local or meta, and assigned

priority. Given the nature of writing across the curriculum initiatives it only makes sense that local instructor goals, insofar as they do not conflict with departmental or programmatic goals, take precedence over those of the writing consultant.

While it is debatable whether the example given is true collaboration, writing consultancy is indeed in line with the tenets of social constructivism, because the writing consultant provides the support (a great deal or just a bit) for the instructor to reach levels of understanding previously unknown, being it in conducting peer reviews, commenting on student papers, or generating assignments. Also, true collaboration unbalances hierarchical relationships, (Bruffee, 1993; Lunsford, 1991) where as this replicates a mercantile exchange. The relationship, however, is not *quid pro quo*—the writing consultant receives nothing from his/her faculty partner in return except the vicarious pleasure of their success. Therefore, since the writing consultant's meta goals are un-articulated and do not drive the relationship, they may feel disappointed when an epiphany is not experienced by the instructor or they go unacknowledged. The writing consultants participating in the program at Pace did not co-teach with their faculty collaborators, unlike the earlier consultancy model presented by Kuriloff; this is a notable difference because it meant the disciplinary faculty retained sole ownership of the course. What is seen most often as a way of achieving multi-layered goals is a nuanced form of collaboration that builds on where faculty are on the WAC ideology continuum and uses writing consultants to scaffold them toward deeper, long-lasting pedagogical change.

It is generally hoped that such lasting change will occur, and as noted, the fair-exchange service model alone will not bring faculty to an epistemological shift as it stands. There are intermediary points on the continuum where consultants and faculty can enjoy a greater degree of collaboration, resulting in a deeper impact on the faculty and feelings of satisfaction for the writing consultant. Another writing consultant at Pace University worked with a professor on computer programming course using the same guidelines and similar types of methods in the classroom but the written analyses of the effort, one by each the consultant and faculty member, revealed quite a different working relationship. At the outset discussion was used as a way to clarify goals, and from the initial “we discussed…” , it was clear this relationship would be much more collaborative than the experience recounted by the other consultant (Anstendig, 2001, October 8). Throughout this account the consultant notes how “we proceeded to set up the project in stages…”, and “we worked out a clearly worded assignment…” and when class size presented a problem “we solved this by making the assignment a group project” indicating the realization of a deeper collaboration (Anstendig, 2001, October 8). This is verified when the instructor relates in her narrative about having had “a wonderful experience” after noting her students’ well structured programs and improvements in cognitive abilities (Anstendig, 2001, October 8). There is no record of the business professor’s response to the writing consultancy involvement, other than the consultant’s account, but it would seem the computer sciences professor has benefitted from her collaboration. Not only did the students’ writing and learning improve, the

professor's positive teaching experience will incline her to be receptive for further WAC engagement, which will move her further down the WAC continuum of acceptance.

A more truly collaborative relationship occurred between the computer science professor and the writing consultant because information flowed between allowing a true *mutuality* (Wallace, 2003) to develop. Mutuality is a concept developed in the composition classroom but is applicable in other pedagogical situations because it is derived in part from tenets of social constructivism. In a writing consultancy situation, each actor seeks to further define their roles through verbally articulating them; mutuality occurs when the co-collaborators experience "the potential to share a range of subject positions and…establish reciprocal discourse relations as they negotiate meaning" (Wallace & Ewald, 2003, p. 3). In the consultant's account of the semester-long collaboration with the professor, the word "we" was used many times in describing what activities took place; the professor looked to the consultant for guidance and noted that she had incorporated her suggestions. Traditional roles of faculty/consultant were subsumed to progress the relationship beyond rote interaction toward true exchange. The occupying of multi-various subject positions by each actor has the resultant effect of destabilizing preset hierarchies and facilitates dialogue aimed a mutual goal setting. In addition, a true negotiation of what Wallace and Ewald (2003) call "course architecture", or curricular design, takes place, which allows each participant to claim partial ownership and thus, raises the stakes of involvement.

When each participant owns part of the writing consultancy relationship, they bring some of themselves to the collaborative table, and each actor is recognized as having something vital and irreplaceable to add. Beyond being a "writing expert" or a "content expert" (Kuriloff, 1992), the co-collaborators brought their own "interpretive agency" to the relationship, which is defined by Wallace and Ewald (2003) as the act of "bringing one's prior experience to bear in the construction of knowledge" (p. 16). To recognize each actor's interpretive agency "shifts both identity and power" in the writing consultancy relationship as it acknowledges a shared middle ground occupied by experiential knowledge (Bickford, 2007, p. 146). Joint ownership of the collaboration also serves to stave of resistance on the part of faculty, resistance being a long-term component of many a WAC narrative. Kurloff's aforementioned dichotomy of "writing experts" and "content experts" has been posited as being a factor toward faculty resistance; Mahala (1994) notes:

> Since many instructors hold the view that teaching is the act of 'representing' one's expertise, they often consider writing instruction either the domain of the expert "writing specialist," or the province of the non-specialist, and therefore not the responsibility of disciplinary instructors who should focus on covering their specialized knowledge (course content). (pp. 38-39)

Deeply ingrained conventions of disciplinarity work against a model of mutuality, so it is incumbent that the writing consultant attempts to view the relationship through the subject position of the faculty member as a means of understanding resistance. Reluctance to engage in specific practices, such as a faculty member being hesitant to share commenting on student papers, may reveal a point of resistance triggered not by a rejection of WAC methods per se, but by

lingering feelings of inadequacy to perform the task under the supervision of a consultant.

Using their interpretative agency in such a way gives the writing consultant a framework for understanding faculty resistance and allows them to use that knowledge to reflect and fine tune their approach. In this context, resistance is repositioned as a positive as it provides a marker for where the collaborative relationship needs to be attended. For one-to-one collaborative WAC initiatives to be successful, the writing consultant needs the training, experience, and savvy to navigate challenging relationship situations and the ability to reflect upon and learn from these experiences. As writing consultants add to their cumulative knowledge, thinking of acceptance of WAC ideology as a continuum will become easier as will their ability to perceive where their faculty co-collaborator lies along that developmental line.

Chapter 4

One-to-One WAC Faculty Development at a Large, Doctoral-Granting University

This chapter details three scenarios in which I as the writing fellow was assigned to work with a professor in the first case and professors and their teaching assistants in the latter two. The collaborations took place as presented beginning in the spring of 2007 and followed the subsequent fall and spring semesters. It was only with the help of careful documentation of interactions, including my personal notes, that the following narratives were able to be reconstructed accurately. Originally, I began taking detailed and dialectical notes as a response to the first professor's lack of engagement as a means of maintaining a dialogue, even if it was only with myself; I found that writing helped me to fill in the gaps in my own observations with added reflective analysis. From this beginning I developed my notes as a construct in which I could record information contextual for the relationship beyond the formalized writing fellows interaction. This allowed me to reflect on the interpersonal nuances that occurred in the relationships and served as cues to behavior when proceeding. The unique nature of a writing fellows implementation focused on collaborative relationships insists great care be given these subtle gestures lest they threaten accumulated good will. The notes provided me an outlet as well as guidance developed through reflection.

However, true analysis and interpretation of the *meaning* of these observations can only truly occur with the passage of time. Weick (1979) articulates a construct in which greater meaning is acquired after the situational stimuli has past and the person has time to reflect:

> The only way a person can sense the separateness of experience is to step *outside* the stream of experience and direct attention to it…it is only possible to direct attention at what has already passed, not at what is yet to come. All understanding originates in reflection and looking backward. (p. 194)

The framework, called “retrospective sensemaking”, is particularly applicable in the writing fellows relationship because in-the-moment engagement is so rich it becomes unintelligible (Weick, 1995). It must be reflected upon to make meaning because “actions are known only when they have been completed” and only then can deeper implications be revealed (Weick, 1995, p.26). Using this construct helped to continue the writing fellows learning process.

The writing fellows initiative at our university was deployed after the conventional workshop methods used by the Gen Ed team failed to achieve the long lasting effects and deep penetration within academic departments as was hoped for by an initial WAC endeavor, the Gen Ed project. As its name implies the Gen Ed project was aimed at courses deemed as core curriculum and geared toward preparing students across the disciplines for their senior capstone paper. Since it was noted that many majors had a serious lackof writing assignments throughout their undergraduate course of study, the Gen Ed project assumed a faculty development model to promote more writing in the respective disciplines. However, the Gen Ed project ran into many obstacles when working with faculty

primarily in a workshop setting and as a result made little noticeable impact within departments on the development of undergraduate writing. Things would begin to change with the implementation of a new iteration of writing across the curriculum under the auspices of the new writing center director who represented the first Ph.D.- holding scholar in that position at our institution. This director brought with her a new conception of a WAC program, one that utilized as part of its approach trained writing specialists who worked one-to-one with assigned faculty. Her vision for a sustainable WAC implementation would strive to truly integrate WAC ideologies into faculty's daily lives both in their classrooms and in their research.

Continuing one-to-one support for faculty may be key to the lasting success the WAC program at large, doctoral-granting institutions and many other similar research universities; in many very real ways the methodology and underlying ideology was taught in the first wave WAC interdisciplinary workshops is still stressed now. The objectives have not shifted so much as the methods have. The meta goal is to make faculty cognizant about their goals for students and how well designed writing assignments can help them achieve their overall learning objectives for their courses. Fulwiler argues in1986 that "teachers need to understand how writing promotes thought" via the writing process while current WAC faculty development models strive "to motivate faculty toward revising their assumptions and practices regarding writing, teaching, and learning" (Jablonski, 2006, p. 101). First wave models advocate including a generous amount of theoretical background (Freisinger, 1980; Toby Fulwiler, 1981; Magnotto &

Stout, 1992) on writing; Britton's expressivist notions were particularly popular with Fulwiler and Young at Michigan Tech early on as a means of incorporating more varieties of writing in science and tech classrooms. Now, however, theory has taken a back seat to far more practical concerns insofar as how WAC initiatives utilize their very precious time resources. In addition, many contemporary faculty are aware of current pedagogical trends that promote the writing process and indeed the impetus for faculty to publish scholarly works has increased, serving to heighten their awareness of the challenges of disciplinary writing.

Many faculty now readily acknowledge the value of including writing to reinforce and interrogate disciplinary content learning, so contemporary WAC initiatives provide assistance in more pragmatic matters. Fulwiler (1986) notes "nearly all teachers seem to be interested in two pedagogical problems associated with the teaching of writing: constructing assignments that generate good writing, and evaluating or responding to the writing once written" so typical WAC activities focus on these two areas (p. 27). Drawing on many topics integral to the first-wave workshop setting, one-to-one WAC collaborations cover assignment design aspects, such as clarifying goals and objectives and developing criteria, classroom implementation, such as low-stakes writing, modeling exercises and peer review, and responding to student writing through a drafting process and using rubrics. And like the workshop it is important "faculty feel comfortable raising questions and exchanging their own experiences and expertise" to gain the most benefit from collaborative methods (Jablonski, 2006,

p. 101). To facilitate a high level of comfortability with the faculty involved in the WAC initiative at our university, "writing fellows", as the consultants were called, received specialized training in writing and collaborative pedagogies.

The other writing fellows and I involved in the endeavor described here were ABD doctoral students and all the product of our English department's intensive writing pedagogy summer workshop and subsequent semester-long course on teaching writing, although subsequent writing fellows would come from departments such as anthropology and meteorology. The workshop and classroom activities focused on seamless assignment and curricula design and support sessions were offered on evaluating student writing. The characteristics, outside of our training, which made me and the other fellows uniquely qualified for this type of implementation are confidence in our ideas, flexibility to changing demands, and the ability to navigate a faculty partnership without outside assistance. The three-person team was in place, and in the fall of 2007, the department of geology was ready to join forces with the WAC/Writing Center director and endeavor in the engagement of a writing fellows program.

Writing Fellows Collaboration One: The Geology Professor

Before the fellows became involved, the groundwork had already been put in place by the director, who had been working with the interim department head on incorporating a significant pedagogical shift toward stressing undergraduate writing throughout the entire department. From the beginning the partnership between the WAC initiative, which encompassed the writing fellows, a writing

fellows coordinator, and the director, and an influential department in the sciences as epitomized by the interim department head, was a top priority and every support system was utilized to ensure its long-term success. The director, with assistance from the writing fellows coordinator, spent the months preceding the actual writing fellows' involvement working with the interim department head and departmental staff to ensure the input of all stakeholders was considered. Our introduction to the department was via a colloquium attended by the WAC team, nine or ten faculty, and approximately twenty departmental graduate research and teaching assistants; the thinking was that changing departmental culture toward undergraduate writing, required the entire department to be involved, from senior faculty to first-year teaching assistants. Each member of the WAC team spoke about a different aspect of wring across the curriculum—general background, writing in the disciplines, the "transparency" of disciplinary writing—and generally opened up a dialogue. Unlike the interdisciplinary workshop of first-wave WAC narratives, the focus was on establishing the basis of a long-term relationship within the department instead of winning over converts to a writing across the curriculum philosophy. Since the interim department head had committed to a ongoing relationship with the WAC team, success in this endeavor would be built incrementally over time with steady support, instead of relying on the sometimes-fleeting enthusiasm of individual faculty. While performing the hard work of teaching writing to undergraduates, collegial enthusiasm can provide sustenance only so long before assistance is necessary to cope with the day-to-day challenges that arise.

The following spring, the writing fellows initiative began in earnest; I was paired with an associate professor for his upper-level course, Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology. We exchanged emails at the beginning of the sixteen-week semester, and the professor included in his correspondence the course syllabus as well as the writing assignment I was told was most important to him. When we finally held our meeting (the second week of the semester), he made very clear that indeed this one primary writing assignment was where he wanted most of our energies to be spent. In conjunction with the course, a Spring Break field trip to a northern New Mexico rift basin was required. To prepare students for the trip, the professor assigned a lengthy "review" paper based on important scholarly articles. During our conversation, he shared that he had been very disappointed in semesters past over the quality of the papers because it seemed as though students had not thoroughly read the articles upon which the papers were to be based.

As we talked further, it became clear that student comprehension of the two articles (and there were only two) was the primary consideration of the assignment because they provided a framework for the impending field trip. Upon review, this concern was made visible through the overwrought paper requirements; using two sources, one ten-page article and one approximately thirty-page article, students were to write a twenty-page paper. The following is the first four requirements and how they were presented for the assignment:

A Microsoft Word document

- 1 inch margins (top, bottom, left, right)

- Font: Arial or Helvetica, 11 pt.
- Line spacing: Double
- Length: Text of no less than 20 pages and no more than 25 pages
- Diagrams (from the two papers) to follow the text.

The layout of the paper, in one-word descriptions, is provided next as well as this admonishment: “Avoid *verbatim* copying of sections of text from the papers; your paper is a summary of the information in the two papers, and must be in your own words”. Lastly, a schedule of due dates for drafts at nine-day intervals was laid out, and I felt hopeful about his openness to exploring the writing process. He then shared with me that “really good papers” were accepted at any point and did not require subsequent drafts, thus, subverting the drafting process. While this was disappointing, I was still very encouraged about my faculty co-collaborator’s attitude toward including more process-oriented elements to the assignment. Moreover, though the assignment was flawed in that it was excessive in the page requirements, it evinced his interest in getting the students to learn via writing.

Developing the writing of students to help them grow as professionals who thought like geologists, though not explicitly articulated by my faculty co-collaborator, was clearly the goal of this paper even though mere formatting issues were listed first on the assignment sheet. His instinct was spot-on—provide students with accepted models from the field and allow them to ventriloquize and act as if until they assumed a level of professionalism. However, the twenty-page paper seemed excessive, and the coursework contained no preparation for writing a piece of such length. This was

compounded by the source requirement of only two texts whose page total exceeded that of the required paper by only twice. One effect of inexperienced writers using an insufficient amount of source material was sure to be incorrect and over citation; the professor, though, was not amenable to lessening the page requirement as he was convinced students would not read the articles if he did. Feeling this was a legitimate concern that needed to be addressed, we talked about ways we could build students up to this very formidable writing task.

It was important to understand how a faulty member could feel a great deal of pressure to cover all required content within the span of a normal sixteen week semester. The professor noted frequently how the courses within the various geology specialties were tightly sequenced, and that students were held accountable for certain types of knowledge upon entering the classroom. My approach was combining writing with content knowledge; when the lecture was on “Isotopes in Igneous Rocks” for example, students would also do an accompanying writing assignment. There were, however, limits to how much my faculty partner would actually integrate new pedagogy, whether he himself would adopt any, or if that was ever his intent. While he was very comfortable in addressing the writing of the review paper that was to serve as field trip prep, my faculty partner was less interested in incorporating writing into other aspects of the course, which was currently full lecture. He viewed course content as essential to becoming a geologist—one who speaks, writes, and most importantly, *analyzes* like a geologist—but was less aware of how that identity was structured in part though writing. The professor looked to the two assigned

articles as models, not for the information and analysis they contained alone, but also as a means of showing the students how geologists write, whether he was aware of it or not. Seizing on the idea of models, I suggested we very explicitly use the articles in class to show the students how this genre of writing is performed in geology.

Seeing immediately the practical value in using models with the students, he agreed and began considering when I could have class time to teach these strategies. From the start he had viewed me as the writing expert and the one who would primarily interact with the students concerning their writing, and this pattern would continue throughout the semester. It was important to me, however, that my faculty co-collaborator would be as engaged in the process of teaching the review paper as possible, so we agreed the session would begin with reintroducing the paper accompanied by a new-and-improved assignment sheet, which he would design with my input. I pointed out how the order in which information appears on an assignment sheet implicitly indicates its importance, i.e. he should invert criteria order on his assignment sheet so “Microsoft Word document” appears last and the information required of each paper section is first. I also asked him to expand on the section descriptions because I felt certain the students would do their best to fulfill the expectations of the paper if they were clearly stated. We discussed how I would then model the essays and using the criteria my faculty partner had generated, break down the sections as they similarly appeared in the articles. Agreeing to do our co-editing of the new assignment sheet through email, we planned to do the session on Thursday of

the following week; this would allow time not only to thoroughly revise the assignment sheet but also to alert the students to come prepared for the discussion.

The modeling exercise proved to be very successful on a number of levels with all the involved parties—my faculty partner, the class, and I—reporting receiving a great deal from of it. One aspect it addressed was relaxing the environment of what was normally a full-frontal lecture class where many students felt too intimidated to ask questions. That the students felt inhibited was not so much indicative of the professor but of a mode of information delivery that plays to the instructor's comfortability much more than the students'. We presented both the new assignment sheet and two research articles using the projector and encouraged students to ask questions if they did not understand the material. In actuality, I facilitated most of the allotted 35-minute time period but tried to pull in the professor whenever possible even though he was visibly less comfortable than he had been during the first portion of the class, which consisted of lecture. The overt purpose of the modeling exercise—clarifying the expectations of the assignment—was definitely achieved, based on casual feedback from students after class.

Encouraged by our initial progress, I was even more pleased when my faculty co-collaborator proved to be very amenable to including a peer review, so we overhauled the syllabus a bit to insert a review session after the first draft. We agreed the best method of implementation would be through our on-line course maintenance platform, D2L, due to class size and paper length; this

would make it easy for students to submit to a drop box for credit and peer partner for review. After discussing how peer review worked via use of prompts and perusing some templates, we decided to use collaborative processes again to design the students' peer review worksheet. I wrote the initial draft and my faculty partner commented back and forth until we achieved the version we desired. Time was allotted so I could come in for a brief visit and explain how the peer review would work, and to their credit, the class was very eager to participate. In fact, the peer review would prove to be the most successful aspect of this collaboration, in terms of how well we as collaborators worked together and its pedagogical effectiveness. The students provided very articulate peer reviews and in some instances provided pages of response to prompts, some of which revealed student misgivings about the assignment.

The Rift paper, as we often referred to it, was the area the professor perceived as needing the most assistance in teaching, without considering that the nature of the assignment lent itself to problems. One student vented his frustration via his peer review comments regarding the work of another student:

> Given the assignment, to summarize a paper that is mostly raw data, write 20 pages, and the emphasis of the prompts of this peer review on the words 'adequate', 'accurately', 'content', 'information', and 'what's missing?', all of which suggest that bulk regurgitation is the goal of this assignment, I really have no suggestion as to how to make this paper more readable.

Ultimately, it did seem memorizing the content of the essays was the main point for the students to glean, but it also seemed as though this objective was not made clear. As my faculty partner and I moved to comment on the student

essays, the fact many passages were lifted with minor alteration from the source material presented huge problems for me but were not a major concern for the professor. On the contrary, he felt as though the quality of these first drafts was well beyond what was evinced in semesters past, something he attributed to the work we had done on the assignment and modeling.

If two collaborators are to comment effectively on student papers, they must include establishing a commonality of standards at some point in the process. To reach a consensus between commenting partners on expectations, either a rubric must be co-designed at the beginning or the evaluation needs to be done together. In this case neither scenario occurred and as a result, the limits of the collaborative relationship were expressed where collaboration faltered—while commenting on student papers. My faculty partner was very keen to have me evaluate the papers for their “writing,” grade them, and send them to him to check their “science”. Though by this point meeting for only fifteen or twenty minutes was becoming logistically difficult, I suggested to him that we should go over all the papers together, but agreed to assess the papers separately. When he finished commenting on the student papers, he sent them through with an email wondering if I might think his comments too harsh. I responded by noting in part:

> Though you say your comments may be harsh (and I haven't looked at them yet), I felt that mine were ineffectual and vague. Maybe we can come up with a different method of commentary for the next go round. While looking at and commenting on all the papers together could be quite time consuming, designing an explicit rubric instead might not be so bad, and I would feel more comfortable giving assessment. We can talk more about it.

After I reviewed his commentary on the students' papers, the thoughts I expressed in the email were confirmed—we needed to have a frank discussion concerning responding to student writing. For each student he typed up a one-page sheet with an overview of his commentary, including a response to my commentary, as well as going through and editing their document. Using the "Track Changes" feature in Microsoft Word Review, the professor went through student papers and struck through and changed a) material that was factually incorrect; b) material that was grammatically incorrect; and c) material that was neither factually nor grammatically incorrect per se, but he preferred it expressed another way. For the most part explanations were not given for the changes and to my eye they sometimes seemed quite arbitrary. I finished my portion of the assessment—though I provided no grades, just commentary, at my insistence—and sent it through to my faculty partner with the determination that evaluating the next paper would be more collaborative.

The disparate nature of our respective commentary highlighted another challenge that was playing out within the context of my relationship to the class compared to that of my faculty co-collaborator. As a long-time writing center consultant, I had always reminded students that I served as another class resource and encouraged them to come by the writing center for an appointment to talk about their papers. In fact I provided an hour outside of my scheduled writing center time every shift devoted solely to students from the course, which meant they could drop in and be virtually guaranteed to see me. Shortly after the modeling exercise students began to visit the writing center articulating their

many difficulties with the assignment due to its length and source requirements. The students who enroll in Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology are as a whole quite bright. Most of them are going into petroleum engineering or seeking careers in the petroleum industry and, even at the undergraduate level, are maintaining rigorous courses of study. It came as no surprise when they started to interrogate the structure of the assignment as well as its objective, and as evinced in the peer review commentary, found them flawed. Pressed to defend the assignment, I was in an awkward position as a writing center consultant because I was not neutral; though the the assignment itself was not a collaborative effort, my relationship to it was in support of the professor. I helped students throughout the semester regardless of the status of the collaboration between the professor and me, but it was always a careful negotiation. Through this experience I would learn to more firmly establish my identity within the context of my future writing fellows involvements; as a faculty development initiative, this iteration of writing fellows' support should be closely linked to the course instructor.

Analysis—The Purchase Model of Writing Consultation

Communications became more sporadic after the first round of drafts were given back to the students; this was understandable as the class was preparing for the Spring Break field trip. Many students were given the pass on writing another draft and told to simply fix what had been noted and submit, so only students with the most undeveloped papers were still writing. Once again I tried to spark my colleague's interest in creating a grading rubric but he continued to

resist the idea. I believed if we could design such a rubric together, the professor would see the weaknesses in the assignment and address them accordingly; however, the collaborative relationship ground to a halt some time after the class returned from Spring Break. Since collaborative endeavors are never risk free, it should be understood that challenges to the relationship will arise and not all will be surmountable. The lack of communication highlighted that the relationship shared by me and the geology professor was not truly a collaborative endeavor—yes, we co-designed peer review sheets and classroom lessons—but the goals we were striving for were entirely those of my faculty colleague. A "process of inquiry" where "the intricacies of discourse" were discussed by equal co-collaborators never occurred because my faculty partner already had his objectives for our endeavor firmly in place (Kuriloff, 1992, p. 98). The participant who determines relationship goals seems the most apparent indicator to discriminate the divergence between an symmetric collaboration and a model more attune with what may be thought of as consultation.

Though consulting has many elements of collaboration, in this instance because goals operated on different levels, the pragmatic objectives of the faculty member and the meta WAC goals of the writing fellow, consulting was more akin to a business model in engaging what Jablonski (2006) refers to as "the generalist mode of expertise" because the practical goals determined the relationship (p. 106). In the business world, if specialized knowledge is needed to complete a task, a consultant who can apply their skills generally across familiar situations is called upon. Schön notes "professional practice includes an

element of repetition. A professional practitioner is a specialist who encounters certain types of situations again and again" (D.A. Schön, 1983, p. 60). In the context of a professional practitioner relationship, the business owner is agreed upon as the one who determines the objectives that the consultant is to strive for; this can be thought of as the "purchase model" for writing fellow implementations (Jablonski, 2006, p. 106). The faculty member is the figurative owner in this case who contracts for outside help and determines goals, and the writing fellow the practitioner skilled at teaching the writing of papers. My faculty colleague had a very focused goal in mind—improving students preparedness for the Spring Break field trip by assigning a rigorous paper—and when that goal was achieved, his interest in our mutual endeavor waned. It is important for the writing center consultant to realize in this model of collaboration the "buyer" or faculty member determines their own needs and looks to the consultant to help address them. They should not reflect and wonder "What…had I done wrong?" like the consultant at Pace University when the business professor she was assigned prepared all his WAC course materials without her input (Anstendig, 2001, October 8). According to the purchase model "faculty can do what they want with the consultant's information" and control how it is implemented, with as much or as little engagement as desired (Jablonski, 2006, p. 106).

However, inherent flaws are present when WAC endeavors are implemented using a purchase model. The first and most glaring is it assumes the "buyer" always knows what is best for the "business", and this is why their goals take precedence. Sometimes, though, the consumer of the consultant's

skills is not aware of the very areas in which they need help; my geology co-collaborator, while open to new ways to teach the paper in the classroom, would not change the length or source requirements of the paper. It was at this point clear that the collaboration between me and my faculty partner would not be quite as mutual as I had initially envisioned as he was definitely choosing his WAC methods from the *ala carte* menu. This does not indicate however that the relationship was in vain; on the contrary, Kuriloff (1992) points out: “when collaboration breaks down, generally one person must cede authority to the other or the effort falls apart” but work can continue in newly acknowledged roles (p. 103). To successfully continue our partnership, I subsumed the larger meta WAC goals I held to serve as a role-player and consultant working for my faculty partner. As such, in a mirror of my role in the relationship, writing was again framed as ancillary and additive to the course as opposed to integral, this of course being in opposition to accepted WAC ideology and another drawback to the purchase model. Overall, however, my faculty partner reported at the end of the semester that our partnership had been a huge success and even asked for me to return the following spring, indicating his goals for the endeavor had indeed been met.

Writing Fellows Collaboration Two: An Associate Professor of Meteorology and Her Two Graduate Teaching Assistants

In the fall of 2009 and for my second collaboration, I would be matched with a newly-tenured professor in the sciences and her two teaching assistants; the WAC director and I met with the professor along shortly after the fall session

began to discuss implementation. The professor has been interested in including more writing in her coursework since she began teaching, so convincing her of the usefulness of incorporating disciplinary writing was not necessary. In fact, having made her interest known to the WAC director, who also oversaw Learning & Teaching, the professor had been working with her on fine-tuning her writing assignments during the past semester. While the WAC director was not able to provide intensive one-to-one mentoring to the professor, she did guide her through the development of materials designed to help the students with their writing. As I would come to find out, the professor and her teaching assistants were so keen to provide students with abundant information about writing, they provided almost too much so as to error on the side of caution. At the time of collaboration, they had writing handouts, more writing information posted to the class D2L site, and additional (and sometimes duplicative) information on a permanent course wiki.

From the very outset, however, I felt if issues arose we would be able to resolve them because the spirit of the relationship was very collaborative. The professor made it very clear she wanted to learn new pedagogical techniques, and when I met her teaching assistants, they mirrored her enthusiasm. This was so very different from the relationship with the professor of the previous semester, where the course of the partnership was already predetermined and little outside my basic writing instructor skills was needed to achieve the professor's goals. In this iteration of the writing fellows' relationship, I would be calling on my "interpretive agency" and bringing all my prior knowledge to bear,

as would the professor and her teaching assistants (Wallace, 2003). While suppositions could be made on the reason for and nature of the two professors' differing outlooks—age, backgrounds, disciplinary differences—the fact remains that a writing fellow must negotiate these challenges and provide their services regardless. In this writing fellows involvement, it would be demanded of me to bring my creative best, as well as a great deal of energy, to the collaboration.

The professor had already incorporated a variety of writing assignments into the course; the students would be responsible for five lab reports throughout the semester as well as a long project/paper that included a mid-term peer review of the introduction and literature review. She said she used the first lab report as a gauge for where the class was, both with their level of writing and content knowledge. Even though the relative importance of the first assignment was minimal, she said she usually evaluated and commented on these herself, as opposed to charging the teaching assistants with the task. The students had already received their first assignment in class, so we agreed to let them proceed; this would help to facilitate a grade-norming session attended not only by me and the professor, but also the teaching assistants, because they would be grading lab reports throughout the semester. The professor felt she had provided the students with ample direction on how to complete the assignment but was still not happy with the results seen last semester. To address this issue as a collaborative team, we needed to look at student papers as a group and initiate a dialogue about what we were looking for as examples of "good" writing as well as how to respond to student papers productively.

The initial assignment for the class and the one we were evaluating was referred to by the teaching assistants as “fill in the blanks”, i.e. the students would have no trouble interpreting how to complete it. Like everything connected with the course, it was presented to the class on a Power Point slide and available with the lecture in its entirety on D2L. The slide directed the students to read the selected scholarly article and “pay close attention on (*sic*) the writing style, the way figures/tables are inserted and referenced in the text, and how references to other studies are made.” They were then to “write a short summary (maximum 400 words)” and submit to the drop box. The students’ writing reflected the ambiguous nature of the assignment with issues in understanding of genre being the most prominent. In many papers, the student couldn’t decide whether to approach the article as a written document of research or transparently summarize its contents, so they would clumsily incorporate elements of both. While the professor was trying to make students aware of the writing conventions for a scholarly article, some of the students misunderstood and analyzed that as the topic of the paper. A secondary challenge, and one that continued to arise frequently throughout the semester, was the difficulty students had in prioritizing the information they read; the benefit of assigning a summary is that it highlighted this gap in student ability and allowed focus to be placed upon it.

The norming session turned out to be far less about grade norming and far more about defining what the professor expected from the papers. In her mind the directives about noting the style of the article were to give the students an

indication of how she would like them to write their lab reports. We talked quite a bit about terms—summary, abstract, review—and discussed how the writing assignment could be perceived as drastically different depending on the genre named. I prodded my co-collaborators to articulate criteria based on their objectives, which were actually very simple; they wanted a succinct description of the paper and discussion of the scientific method. Through our conversation, it was exampled how difficult it was to negotiate and define the criteria for the text in a manner that the students could understand. My faculty colleague and her teaching assistants were surprised to discover that what they took for granted as an easily understood directive was misinterpreted by many students; in fact, the majority of the student papers were unsuccessful in the eyes of the professor. Modeling the type of writing we desired seemed to be the best approach because it was so challenging to describe we wanted; it was far easier to "show" the students. My suggestion to retrofit this assignment with a modeling exercise based on the original reading was well-received, especially by the professor who eagerly volunteered class time the following Monday for its presentation to the class. While preparing over the weekend for the ensuing class, I had something of an epiphany. As I read the scholarly article upon which the assignment was based, it occurred to me that it may be far more productive to use the texts generated by the students to develop a model. It seemed particularly relevant in light of the fact that the reams of information provided as background to this writing assignment thus far did little to help prepare the students to write it. Using my faculty colleague's course materials outlining features for an abstract

(“Guidelines for Writing Formal Lab Reports”), I prepared a brief, ten minute presentation about the important points of summarization. Next, I constructed a composite essay that met the expectations of the assignment—a cut-and-paste of “good” sentences (meaning concise, coherent, and informative) from a variety of student papers. This would anchor a presentation emphasizing the importance of prioritizing information and other features of summary while the students, all trying to pick out their own sentences, would be paying rapt attention.

I took this idea to our next meeting, and true to their openness to new pedagogical ideas, the professor and teaching assistants were enthusiastic about the newly added wrinkle of having students work with their own texts. We worked on the logistics of the retooled assignment, and unlike my previous writing fellows experience, the professor as well as the teaching assistants, wanted to be actively involved with presenting the writing assignment to the class. This further heightened the underlying unity of our collaboration: we were four instructors teaching writing in meteorology as a team. As such, it meant that good ideas about writing were not only limited to my purview, and scientific thinking was not restricted to my meteorological cohorts. While we went over the course schedule to see if a peer review could be squeezed in, the professor had an inspired idea: the students could revise their summaries and post them to their groups (the students were grouped by final paper topic at the beginning of the semester) on D2L. Then the groups were to each compose their own cut and paste summary, similar to what I would be presenting; these summaries would then be rated by

our collaborative teaching team, with the best being posted to the course wiki. My colleague's insight into this activity showed an intuitive receptivity to WAC ideals and excited me for many reasons: 1) the students would be rehearsing the skills, such as prioritization, we had covered in class; 2) students would have their writing peer reviewed; 3) it would be a great team-building exercise (which my faculty colleague strongly desired); and 4) the students' writing would be valorized, and even published. The process followed to reach the aforementioned outcome was one of true collaboration, and the wiki in particular would serve a as focal point of our efforts for the rest of the semester.

While our first collaborative endeavor for METR3163 was an unqualified success, I believed we needed to keep an ongoing writing project at low boil to reinforce the importance of writing within the context of this course. I brought up the wiki again at our next meeting, and my faculty colleague apologized for her paucity of information on its contents and upkeep. She was unfamiliar with wikis and had turned responsibility for it over to one of the teaching assistants, but he had become very busy so consequently the wiki was underdeveloped. We joined the teaching assistants in the lab where they gave us an introduction to the wiki; this seemed to include the professor, too, as she seemed uncomfortable with the wiki technology. Seeing a resource with a great deal of potential, I suggested we think about what made wikis so useful: providing a forum for writers to interact with technology and each other's texts with real time that I publication capabilities. I said wanted more student participation and access because I believed currently the wiki was perceived as a static site when it

should be a aggregative knowledge base. One of the teaching assistants also admitted to misgivings about the wiki, as he found it to be very confusing and believed students would not have patience to navigate it. We talked a great deal about how the wiki worked, and somehow, bringing me in to the group had changed the dynamic (because I know a little bit about the technology, too) just enough to allow my faculty colleague to take ownership of the wiki along with teaching assistants.

As we fine tuned our working methods, the wiki project began to take shape and proved to be the exemplar for the type of collaborative endeavor I envisioned when preparing to serve as a writing fellow. The first step was convening a meeting to examine the issue at hand, such as the wiki, with all members of the collaboration present—me, the professor, and both teaching assistants. Once again as a point of comparison, these meetings were altogether different than my prior writing fellows experience. They were held in a lab at the National Weather Center on the University of Oklahoma Norman campus around a large table we all shared; there was ample technology available to work with the course D2L site, as well as the wiki, and hot coffee was always freshly brewed. When contrasted to sitting across a piled-high desk from the geology professor on a hard chair in a supremely cluttered office, this setting was very conducive to a roll-up-the-sleeves collaborative effort. As a result, many of our meetings were two-hour marathons packed with differing views, conversation, and negotiation, but decisions about implementation were always reached as a group. Contentious issues, such as how the course wiki was to be

utilized, were brought to the table and debated, which made it possible for everyone to consider beyond their perceptual boundaries.

Coming from an English composition background, I was most excited about the course wiki's potential as a venue to publish the students' writing, a common pedagogical strategy in the writing classroom used to incent student participation. I had a vision of students being able to contribute in building the pages' content for the wiki and add to the course knowledge base. However, my co-collaborators had strong feelings about wanting editorial control, in particular the ability to edit student posts before they were visible. It was vital to them that all issues concerning student access, privacy, and academic integrity were given the utmost attention. Their vehemence puzzled me; I had conducted discussions in real time, as well as on message boards, in English classes without any irregularities occurring whatsoever. Academic integrity was of course very important in English composition as well, but for good or for ill, many students viewed their freshman composition courses as low stakes; their efforts to cheat or plagiarize were minimal and easy to spot. However, the meteorology program was high profile and very competitive; the incentives to cheat could be perceived as being much greater. They argued that students might copy each other's posts and take credit for them, resulting in a grading nightmare, or somehow compromise the integrity of the system. After long discussion I acknowledged the validity of their concern and agreed to take over editorial duties as a moderator of student posts on the wiki. This was just one of many points I passed on the learning curve that occurred during this writing fellows

collaboration where my own background did not corroborate new knowledge. But if the collaborative relationship is built upon dialogue, each member can provide support to the others to push them outside their typical patterns of thought.

After intense sessions filled with the consideration of many ideas, we adjourned to work on our delegated tasks; we all strove to make the times in between meetings very productive. In preparation for our semester-long wiki implementation, one teaching assistant organized and edited the current wiki information while the other worked with the wiki code to install ample safeguards against the possibility of cheating. The professor worked on fitting our additional activities into the schedule and syllabus, and I composed the assignment. For the ongoing writing project the course would have a wiki page for a "Student Survival Guide." This page would be open to access by the students, who would submit short one-to-two sentence helpful hints to be passed down to classes in the semesters to come. Complete instructions for the students appear on the wiki page and carry a disclaimer that the wiki administrators would have the final editorial control over all content and note "practicality, creativity and overall quality of written submissions will ultimately determine which will be permanently immortalized on the course wiki." Students would be able to post their suggestions to the wiki for the entire month of November; after that submissions would no longer be allowed and voting would begin. For one week, the students would be able to vote on their favorite choices for permanent inclusion on the course wiki via insta-poll linked to the wiki by my blog. Great care was taken to

ensure fairness and integrity of the administration of the project in particular since extra credit points, up to five per student, were awarded. I assumed the responsibility as “instant editor” for this page and adjusted the settings to have notifications emailed notifying me of any changes; this allowed me to check the students entries immediately and served to alleviate the group’s fears about inappropriate postings. [See Appendix 1. for image capture of wiki page]

My co-collaborators greatest concern was that students would find a way to “game the system” and garner unfairly earned points, and this issue arose frequently in discussion. One of the teaching assistants set up a section of the wiki page allowing students to create a secure login, which was necessary in order to post, and added the following: “Keep in mind that edits are tracked using the wiki software so we will know if you are stealing.” I suggested we soften the stance of the sentence a bit as in: “Keep in mind that edits are tracked using the wiki software to protect the integrity of student contributions.” The line between maintaining the integrity of the course and allowing leeway for potential student misconduct was one that was constantly analyzed because among our collaborative group that was set as a priority. While my background in English may not have hinted at the type of high-pressure culture in which I was currently immersed, one where cheating seems like a viable, if desperate, option, my colleagues were helping me to understand the validity of their concerns.

The students responded very well to the wiki project when it was introduced to the class; they appreciated the examples and asked many questions. Similar to how we had presented material in previous classes, I went

through and thoroughly explained how the project worked as my faculty colleague operated the overhead projector and Power Point technology. We then had a student come up for a test run in which he created a login and entered an actual suggestion while we projected it for the class. By this time we as a team had honed our collaborative presentation skills and provided an instructive lecture that seemed to pique the class's interest. Over the course of the following weekend, contributions to the wiki exploded from five from one student to eighteen from six students. As a final precaution for student anonymity, I and one of the teaching assistants maintained the page via email notification and would log on and obscure the name of the student with the most recent edit, something we found we were not able to do with the settings.[18] Overall, the wiki project was a success as evinced in both pedagogical measures and those of implementation. Student participation was strong, especially considering the wiki page was added so late in the semester; out of 55 students enrolled in the course, 12 students submitted 37 entries with the top 51% (as voted by fellow students via weblog insta-poll[19]) selected for permanent inclusion on the course wiki.

The entries themselves ran the gamut from practical advice, such as: "Go to [the professor's] office hours for questions on the final project because she is very helpful"; to useful nuggets of information: "MathType is a very easy-to-use equation editor for your lab reports. You can download a free copy online"; to

[18] By definition most wikis do not permit anonymous editing
[19] I established a weblog attached to the course on wordpress, which I utilized because of its user-friendly instant polling feature. Upon voting users would see the classroom polling results for that entry immediately and be locked out from voting again for it.

those that revealed the early processes of identifying as a meteorologist in a community of kind: “When writing your lab report, make sure your preface your equation by talking about what it represents, add the equation, then talk about what each variable means with its units. If you have already talked about a variable in previous equations, you do not need to repeat it”. While student self interest and promotion surely influenced the voting, quality generally won out; in the above examples, the first did not get voted in, while the latter two did. Feedback received though casual conversation with students corroborated the success of the project and indicated their openness to similar endeavors in the future. It can be surmised that student participation and quality of the suggestions have the potential to only increase if the project is stretched out across the entire semester.

The wiki project and its subsequent implementation was a perfect example of a collaborative endeavor that encompassed the goals of all the participants and was a relationship negotiated at every juncture. Throughout the semester, we also implemented peer review, co-taught classes, and commented on lab reports as a four-person team motivated by interlocking and symbiotic agendas. My faculty colleague already recognized writing was an important part of learning in the meteorology classroom, and once provided with the needed support and guidance, she endeavored to make her own assignments even more effective. The graduate teaching assistants were extremely motivated through both competition (an ever-present factor among meteorology students) and the high regard with which they held the professor. They put a great deal of effort into

revamping confusing aspects of the course wiki, such as navigation and simplifying the informational sections while being open to suggestions. The lab reports were the sole purview of the teaching assistants after the first week, and we worked all semester on responding to student papers. By the end of the semester they reported seeing greater accuracy and more consistency in the students lab reports, which allowed them to respond to higher order concerns in the writing in an increasingly sophisticated manner.

Analysis—The Collaborative Model Fully Realized

I believed the semester-long collaboration to be an unqualified success in accordance with my own goals as a writing fellow, both pragmatic and meta objectives. With regard to the class, the students appeared to experience many benefits from the writing fellows involvement in the course. Through their attendance and participation the students evinced their “buy in” while utilizing the information given through presentations, comments, and the wiki. My interactions with the students were more clearly defined and therefore less complicated; I was viewed as part of a teaching team who were seen as all being very accessible to students. It was hugely helpful that our collaboratively-designed assignments were never viewed as busy work by the students (as surmised by the students’ participation and overall enthusiasm) because we put much thought into a pedagogically sound implementation that would be both fun and interesting. Ultimately, the quality of the collaborative relationship between me, the professor, and her two graduate teaching assistants provides the best barometer for its success. We were task- and goal- oriented, open-minded to

other's views, willing to revise, amenable to suggestion, and most importantly willing to work hard to implement new methods of learning in meteorology. As an indication of acceptance of WAC attitudes, these things stand as a clear marker with hints of even deeper engagement possible.

The characteristics of our collaboration may also indicate the paradigm that exists within the sciences of validating and encouraging collaborative endeavors. In their study examining collaborative endeavors, Ede and Lunsford (1990) cite Derek Price[20] in noting "the trend toward increasing collaboration best distinguishes premodern from modern science" in both research and writing activities (p. 75). Owing this to the increasing complexity of research as well a greater interdisciplinary emphasis, my partner explained how the majority of her research is performed and written up collaboratively, with first author status (the name appearing in the citation index) going to her student. This also may indicate why peer reviews and the collaborative writing exercises were handled with such dexterity by the students; with their science backgrounds, group research and writing were not foreign concepts but immediately accessible through disciplinary conventions. Through the familiarity of my collaborators, I was able to immerse myself in the course and become comfortable with science research methodology, as well as discover how strategically they had already adopted some pedagogical classroom strategies. Our situation was akin to a second- wave WAC study looking at revision in an upper-level biology class: the professor had already implemented peer review, but the students' lab reports,

[20] *Little Science, Big Science,* New York: Columbia UP, 1963

like the those in the study still were “often rambling and disorganized discussions of unassimilated information” (Flynn, 1986, p. 160). Further support from a skilled writing fellow helped to shore up skills needed to fine tune peer reviews, but in our case the partnership encouraged the development of a repertoire of strategies, including modeling, group work, extra credit writing assignments, and responding more effectively to student writing. Taking WAC involvements to this level is vital because “without faculty ownership, [they] provide…only partial and short-term fixes” to the challenge of incorporating efficacious writing instruction in the disciplines (Jablonski, 2006, p. 141). To maintain this type of WAC engagement, the relationship between the participants needs to be one of respect and frankness with mutually aligned goals.

Setting goals and objectives should be the first priority when writing consultants work with faculty partners; Kuriloff’s (1986) model of consultancy posits it as a difficult, but essential task:

> So much common ground is not easily established, but some common ground is mandatory for a collaborative venture of this sort to succeed. I found that, although we used different words express it, we had similar goals for our students. By raising the same questions I would raise in any writing situation, we were able to identify our priorities and to reach a common understanding about how issues of form, audience, purpose, and the relationship between reading and writing would be handled in the course. (p. 98).

Explicit articulation of goals is vital so they can be examined and prioritized, as well as to be sure they resonate with WAC ideals. Most importantly, a discussion of objectives gives each member of the collaborative team insight into what they each hold as significant. For example, whereas working on student grammar

might not figure prominently in my overall goals for the course, our discussion of the importance of grammar provided a great deal of insight into how my faculty colleague, a non-native English speaker, relates to the language. Her occasional hesitancy with the language would serve to inform all our exchanges from that moment and affect assignments and classroom implementations as well.

Faculty Feedback—"That Certainly Helped a Lot"

My faculty colleague, a self-professed "science geek" appreciated the support provided and in her feedback voiced what she felt was a common conundrum when she and her scientific colleagues attempt to teach disciplinary writing: "While I would say that most of the meteorology faculty and lecturers somehow learned how to write a paper over the years by reading other papers and passing through peer review processes, we do not necessarily know how to **explain** why certain styles are good and others are not" (Personal communication, January 28, 2009). [See Figure 2. for complete feedback] The perceived gap between the writing the meteorological faculty expect from students and their skills at teaching them how to perform it looms large, but my collaborator noted "I have also learned how simple changes, such as rephrasing questions, can promote student engagement" (Personal communication, January 28, 2009). The nuances of language were revisited many times throughout the semester often to determine what was "just the right amount" of instruction or response. If too much information was provided, such as on the wiki or through commentary, the students only seemed to become mired in it, reflecting a

disproportionate amount of work for the results. This insight made practical sense to my faculty colleague, who wrote:

> I have also learned a lot about better balancing the efforts in providing feedback to the students about their writing. If an assignment is not graded or not worth a lot of points, the grading should also not be a big effort. Or in other words, it makes no sense to spend hours to provide each student individual feedback on their writing if the assignment does not count for much as they will probably not look at it. Such assignments can however still be very useful if feedback is provided in a different way, e.g. by conducting a peer review, and/or highlighting in the classroom some of the common mistakes and some of the things that we really liked. Mary's idea of pulling out nice sentences from different texts to form one "master" text that we then discussed in the classroom worked really well and students learned much more than from some cryptic feedback (and with 55 students individual feedback easily becomes cryptic!) written on each individual text (Personal communication, January 28, 2009).

The importance of this insight must not be understated as writing fellows efforts are broadened and the goal of WAC implementation shifts to sustainability. Workshops alone can only achieve so much penetration into the pedagogical lives of disciplinary faculty, and while their acceptance of WAC ideals is always an objective, more vital is providing the immediate practical support for day-to-day classroom implementation. If faculty are currently using WAC methods in the classroom and are feeling frustrated because the cost/benefit ratio does not seem worth the effort (a point my faculty colleague was approaching before our collaboration) simple feel-good collegiality will not ameliorate the situation. They are in need of techniques and strategies to help them implement more writing in the classroom with greater efficiency, which will in turn lead to better student response.

My faculty colleague, like myself, was very satisfied with the outcome of our semester-long collaboration, and the few reservations she expressed indicate areas needing focus in the future. Logistical concerns comprised three of the five points for improvement, and she addressed the difficulty of implementing peer review with the existing D2L course maintenance platform and admitted "in the future we need to find ways to better manage the peer review" (Personal communication, January 28, 2009). And while my faculty colleague notes "the dialogues we had about using new media technologies were quite eye-opening for me", she reflects that "having such a large class with 55 students makes it tricky to integrate assignments that better use some of the new media and are more interactive" when recounting our difficulties securing the wiki (Personal communication, January 28, 2009). The enormity of the task to be accomplished in just one semester seemed to demand that less emphasis be placed somewhere; unfortunately, this seemed to occur at the expense of the relationship between me and the teaching assistants. Our status as both students and instructors served to make available meeting time increasingly rare as the semester went on, further complicated by both teaching assistants preparing for general exams. The professor pointed this out as well—"the interactions between the two TAs and Mary could have been slightly better"—but acknowledges that our time was at a premium "once the semester was in full swing" (Personal communication, January 28, 2009). In fact in the end, time constraints, a reality of academic life, made an impact on the efficacy of the project.

My faculty partner and I concur that one of the most important adjustments that can be made to the current writing fellows project is to allow it more time, i.e. the preplanning stage prior to the start of the semester should be extended as much as possible. To achieve a fully-realized collaboration both participants need to be involved in the design of the "course architecture" or "the managing of the assignments and activities that make up the day-to-day procedural functioning of the class and in particular the ways in which…[they] encourage or discourage interaction among disciplinary knowledge and students' varied knowledge and experiences" (Wallace, 2003, p. 11). This serves two purposes, the first being logistical, because additional time would allow for tasks such as streamlining information that impeded a greater involvement by the teaching assistants. Second, sharing course architecture is akin to truly collaboration because objectives are expressed through the expectations of the course; if collaborative partners develop implementations they will naturally serve the goals of both. For the writing fellow, this means achieving meta goals aligned toward sustaining WAC initiatives as well as the immediate objective of assisting the instructor. In summary, the lack of time for advance preparation was the number one difficulty as articulated by my faculty colleague:

> Starting the collaboration just at the beginning of the semester after the course syllabus and schedule was pretty much set in stone was clearly not ideal. In the future, the course syllabus and in particular the design of any writing oriented assignments and help session, should happen as a collaborative effort before the start of classes. (Personal communication, January 28, 2009).

The other challenges faced during our collaboration seemed to spring from lack of pre-semester preparation, which is simple to address. Unfortunately, my next involvement would be challenged by time constraints to an even greater degree.

Writing Fellows Collaboration Three: The Professor and his Graduate Teaching Assistant

The following spring I continued the association I had begun with the department the previous fall by working with a professor who desired after some time away from this student population to teach undergraduates. He is a scholar held in high esteem throughout the field and, as long-time tenured faculty, is a foundational member of the department. As his position in one of the most distinguished meteorology programs in the country would dictate, he travels frequently; because of this much of the collaboration occurred with the graduate teaching assistant assigned to the course. After experiencing such a positive relationship my last collaboration, I was just as eager to work with the professor's graduate teaching assistant as I was with him; it was also in keeping with the overarching WAC goals of influencing the culture of writing throughout the entire department. He had been abreast of the success of the writing fellows collaboration with the other course professor and was keen on maintaining the positive momentum of the project as well as experimenting with WAC methods in his undergraduate course. The professor was thoroughly likeable and articulate, but it became apparent immediately from the outset that much of his time was consumed with his professional activities outside of teaching.

Our first meeting had occurred a few weeks before the semester started and was attended by meteorology faculty participants in the writing fellows endeavor past and present as well as those who hoped to also receive writing fellows assistance for their courses. My faculty co-collaborator was the first to speak as he had to dash off to an out-of-town conference. Expressing some apprehension about teaching writing in a course he had not actually taught in years, he nonetheless seemed ready to plunge ahead and outlined his plan for including writing based on equation homework for every class. It was difficult for us to conceive of what he meant, and he had difficulty summarizing his ideas; the professor promised to send me materials via email and excused himself from the meeting. While we continued on with a constructive recap of the previous semester, it would have been preferable to prepare for the upcoming collaboration with the professor himself because in every writing fellows iteration more advance time would have been very beneficial.

Our first collaborative meeting was attended as well by the graduate teaching assistant assigned to this course, and he impressed me as a very able and intelligent person with whom I would be happy to work. My faculty colleague, who usually had a persistent air of hurriedness surrounding him, was still trying to tie up a few loose ends before we began and as a result was rushing around. When he sat down to join us, all his thoughts about the assignment burst out in a torrent as he pushed something labeled "Writing Solutions to Problem Sets" (under the main title, *Theory of Algorithms*) across the table. Using the aforementioned sheet, the professor explained that I was to speak to

the class that very afternoon and explicate the writing process for the equation homework, which the students would then turn in before the next class and repeat every week hereafter. He stopped for a pause and asked the teaching assistant if he had posted the "Writing Solution" handout to D2L and with the affirmation looked to me as if we were done. Since I had received no information from the professor via email prior to this declaration, I was a bit stunned by this sudden pronouncement and was hoping we would be doing more evaluation of goals first but was ready to shift gears.

Unlike my work with the other professors and teaching assistants, this professor did not expect to examine and discuss objectives. On the contrary, he had prepared a prepackaged writing assignment using materials generated years prior, for a different course at another university (the "Writing Solution" handout), which he wanted me to implement starting that afternoon. Surprised by his request to take over the class in a few scant hours with little preparation, I focused on the most immediate concerns first, primarily that while I would enjoy meeting the class that very day, I felt uncomfortable teaching an unfamiliar writing assignment. Recounting the experiences of the previous semester, I shared how the professor and her teaching assistants had provided ample information on how to write to the students, in many forms, but simply making it available did not guarantee better student papers. What would be most helpful, I suggested, would be to use models, noting that it would be beneficial for me as well, since I was having difficulties visualizing how the assignment would take shape. Perhaps I could meet the class that afternoon as he intended and

introduce myself, the semester-long collaboration, and the planned writing assignment; establishing my credibility would be important to successful class interactions and similar low-key exchanges worked well the previous semester. Then we could introduce the models collaboratively to further emphasize the collective nature of our endeavor.

After a bit more discussion about the logistics of implementation, the professor agreed to work up a sample of the writing assignment and would make sure it was posted to D2L by midnight that night. I would join the teaching assistant in class later that day to talk about the semester-long writing fellows project and the writing that would be incorporated into the course. The teaching assistant would handle much of the explanation of the writing assignment because it was mostly an assemblage of equations, which perplexed me greatly. After perusing the sample, I could see the "writing assignment" we were to be working with was eighty percent equation and twenty percent expository prose, and it resembled a math equation far more than any genre of writing. In the classroom presentations I would focus on more general issues concerning flow, transitions, and change markers while fielding general questions about writing for the class with the teaching assistant addressing assignment specific concerns.

In class, we instructed the students to give their best effort on the writing assignment/homework using what they had learned so far, as well as the sample provided online; the professor and teaching assistant also assured the class leniency would be exercised in grading. My next suggestion to the professor and teaching assistant was going to be that we allowed students to revise their first

attempts, but I wanted to see the result of the student work first so as to provide justification. We met again immediately after students turned in their writing assignments to go over and evaluate their efforts. As expected, a few students did fairly well, but for the most part, the homework was sorely lacking in the areas my faculty colleague wanted to see improvement, such as improvement in the logical sequencing and development of the responses. I broached the idea of using the students' own work as a model for the homework equation and noted how successful this method was the previous semester in helping students understand the parameters of the assignment. My faculty colleague and the teaching assistant voiced anticipated concerns about students seeing each others' work or feeling "dumb" in class; I assured them it was all completely anonymous. Like the previous semester, we would only use portions of student text on the projector and all identifying features would be removed. Samples of student writing would include those that epitomize the assignment, those that almost address the assignment, and papers that completely miss the mark.

After some initial reservations, the professor agreed to try the modeling technique using the students' own work and we decided to conduct the sessions at the end of the week. Unfortunately, my faculty colleague had to leave immediately for Boulder, Colorado, to attend a conference and would not be back until Sunday; this meant we would not have time to take an in-depth look at the student papers and pick out the samples as a group. In fact, he did not have time to go over the homework assignment and asked the teaching assistant grade them, using a key that the professor would email to him later. As we

adjourned our meeting the teaching assistant and I agreed to meet the following afternoon to decide on our student samples and work on our presentation; I assured the professor we would provide a full report upon his return.

The collaboration with the teaching assistant was problem free, and we met all of our objectives for the modeling session. We wanted to give students a structure for the writing assignment, have them focus on logical sequencing, and improve their clarity, which was accomplished by showing examples, of varying success, of other students' work. Going through the submissions from the entire class, we pieced together a presentation where the teaching assistant and I could note specific good or not-so-good points and then elaborate upon ways for the students to navigate the assignment demands successfully. The students were free to ask questions and many of them participated, though the discussion was never as unmediated and productive as it had been in the meteorology course of the previous semester. Overall, we considered the presentation a success because of student participation and would report as much to the professor when he returned from out of town. I also wanted to pursue the idea of the students having the opportunity to revise the first homework assignments, and although the teaching assistant was not very enthusiastic about the idea (probably because he had to grade them), he said he would mention it to the professor on Monday. We parted ways on a very positive note, and it seemed, as a team, were off to a good start.

When I checked in the following Monday to report our success to the professor, student revision of the first homework assignment no longer seemed

to be an option, so we agreed to reconvene after the next writing assignment had been assessed. The teaching assistant emailed me the following week and said there was noticeable improvement in the homework and that students were asking more questions regarding it in class, but his missive included nothing about a meeting. When I followed up with the professor the next week (week four of the semester), he said he realized “the ball is in [his] court” and while I was not needed in class this week, maybe for next time it would be “possible… to talk about good practices for articulating logic and arguments? (syllogisms and all that?)” Responding that I would gather materials in preparation for our next meeting, asked him to email me when he had a date and time. This represented our final exchange for two months.

At this point, a lapse in communication signified a hiatus in the collaborative relationship. Citing demands on his time, the professor was for the most part unavailable for any type of collaboration, though I was kept abreast of class activities though D2L, the online course management platform. However, nothing more was ever done with the original collaborative assignment; while the students continued to do the weekly homework, the emphasis on the writing aspect was absent. There was a great deal more I wanted to accomplish within the context of this writing fellows collaboration but decisions as to the extent of my involvement were not mine to make because our relationship did not permit it. Unlike the true collaboration I had achieved with the other professor and her two teaching assistants, while we shared motivations for involvement, I and my faculty colleague had no foundational relationship based on mutuality to work

from. The lack of time the professor had to invest on this endeavor limited the depth to which our relationship could develop. Therefore, our classroom pedagogy reflected the shallowness of the collaboration and the resultant writing assignment was was very thin.

Had it ended here, this writing fellows encounter would be categorized as a "wash"—not very much in the way of concrete pedagogical change via writing assignments had been accomplished, but goodwill with the department was maintained, and the program would continue on. Near the end of the semester, however, an email invitation to the Writing Fellows open house compelled the professor to reconnect with me. A conscientious professional, he no doubt was concerned his lack of time to participate in the writing fellows initiative would reflect poorly on the relationship with the entire department, though this was not at all the case. Replying to an email sent two months prior, the professor outlined prompts for a prose assignment that I could "evaluate" and look for good "logic"; unfortunately, what he suggested would probably stimulate "anti-writing" (the empty writing students produce to resist a meaningless assignment) not to mention the ill-will of the students. Late in the semester as it was, the already-overburdened meteorology students in the class would demand a real assignment, not busywork, if it was going to be added less than a month before semesters' end. In the interest of preserving credibility with the students as well as maintaining the good will of the writing fellows association with meteorology, it seemed prudent to consider this last assignment carefully as opposed to

throwing something out in haste. The professor and I agreed to meet that Friday to discuss the assignment.

Since using the meeting to review goals and objectives did not represent an effective means to facilitate dialogue, I prepared assignment prompts to go into it with in hand and keep the interaction as simple as possible. I had felt rushed and overwhelmed in the past when the professor had used similar methods in preparation for our meetings, but decided perhaps that is what made him most comfortable. Using his the ideas from his email as a starting point I generated sample prompts that would the demand logical sequenced thought my faculty colleague wanted to see demonstrated:

> Students could respond to this prompt: "Summer internships in meteorology, even without pay, are the best use of students' summer time because they speed up education and training for a career."
>
> Students could write a summary of an article in a pertinent journal (*Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics?*) after a modeling session on summarization.
>
> Are particular instruments used to study atmospheric dynamics? Students could chose an instrument, research it, and write about its historical background and development as well as current uses.
>
> Similar to above, students could chose an atmospheric anomaly, write a summary about it and show the math behind the event.
>
> Students could respond to this prompt: "Given the relationship between climate dynamics and the implications for worldwide environmental change, outline the importance of studying meteorology as it relates to the future of the global community."

The prompts addressed slightly different writing contexts; while two of them demanded implicit argument, others pertained to scientific disciplinary information. I was eager to present them to my faculty colleague.

It was noticeably quieter and less hectic when we met the following Friday at my colleague's office in the meteorological center, and the teaching assistant was not present for our meeting as he and the class were involved in some field work. We talked a bit about how the semester was going for the class and the type of assignment we could realistically expect of them; like my initial impression I found my co-collaborator to be very friendly and, once he slowed down a bit, easier to engage. The pre-prepared prompts served as excellent dialogue starters as to what he wanted to accomplish with the assignment as well as providing an opening to considering larger WAC concepts. For example, he had never considered having student work with actual research journal articles as indicated in the second prompt where they compose summaries. The more we talked of the idea, the greater his excitement became at the thought of including it next semester; it turned out to be the very way had been piqued by the study of meteorology. For this assignment, however, he wanted the students to write about a topic similar to the last prompt where the larger implications of a career in meteorology become salient. We agreed to collaborate on an assignment based on the last prompt, and I was to generate the assignment sheet and send it through to him for further commentary and editing.

For the implementation, I attended class and introduced the assignment; along with my faculty co-collaborator and the teaching assistant, we fielded questions about the writing assignment and its construction. Similar to my prior experiences in other courses I had suggested that we use D2L so students could submit to a drop box, facilitating the flow of paperwork. Knowing already that I

was going to suggest a revision opportunity, I wanted to do everything I could to make implementation go smoothly. The professor was again going to be out of town later in the week but encouraged us to use the student papers as models again, feeling the students had gotten a great deal out of the exercise the first time. I pursued the idea of offering students a rewrite opportunity on the papers as well and the professor agreed. While there was no time to sandwich in a peer review, we had nonetheless constructed a very effective sequence with which to scaffold the writing assignment. We also collaborated on constructing a rubric that had a section addressing concerns such as structure, organization, and grammar as well as a aspects concerning the accuracy of the science in the paper. We were hard pressed to complete everything in time for the end of the semester, but we managed to evaluate and comment on all the revised papers, the grades of which were much better than the first iteration. Though I never again met face-to-face with my faculty co-collaborator or even the graduate teaching assistant, I could definitely say we were a team by the end of the semester. The challenge of redeeming our writing fellows collaboration called upon us to bring resources together rapidly that would serve the students the best.

Analysis—Positively Situated on the Continuum

Working with this last professor represented a unique opportunity for me as a writing fellow because the nature of the engagement was very different from the other two relationships. Many times, it seemed to hint back at previous experiences: the assignment already set in stone at the beginning of the

partnership, like the professor in the first scenario, or the overall, positive attitude toward the endeavor, like the professor and her two teaching assistants in the second scenario. If acceptance of WAC ideals and methodology is a continuum with pure rejection on one end and total acceptance and implementation on the other, the professor in the last scenario would fall in middling territory. Unlike the first professor's version of the purchase model in which he wanted to try only what pertained to the chosen assignment, the last professor was willing to entertain new ideas but without a firm grasp of what that would entail insofar as his involvement and commitment. While Jablonsky (2006) suggests that a consultant "must consciously and deliberatively attempt to move the relationship into a more mutually participatory framework" (p. 140), the consultant must take care not to press issues too quickly at the risk of thwarting the developing collaboration. My previous co-collaborator confirms this when she notes, "I really appreciated that [the consultant] did not push her own agenda but was open to listen" allowing the professor and teaching assistants to articulate "what we considered important for the students to learn and accomplish in[the course]" (Personal communication, January 28, 2009). Ultimately, this is the goal of the writing fellow: to provide support for a disciplinary faculty member interested in using writing to reinforce learning in their classrooms, regardless of how invested they are in WAC ideals. Germane to this discussion would then be promoting methods that allow participants in a collaborative endeavor to gauge the amount and type of assistance provided.

Chapter 5

Defining the Writing Fellow

In the preceding chapters, it has been shown how one-to-one collaborative relationships, in particular those of a trained writing fellow and faculty co-collaborator, can be used to further the goals of WAC implementations. Because of the depth of penetration achieved within a department, the tangible support provided to faculty, and prospects for long-term WAC sustainability, writing fellows paired with faculty on semester-long projects offer benefits in a research-oriented institutional setting that workshops cannot provide. The brief historical survey of WAC initiatives presented within these chapters, however, emphasizes that there is no "one size fits all" when considering how to conceive of WAC at various divergent institutions. One needs only to look at the genesis and development of the interdisciplinary workshop to recognize that methods should constantly be scrutinized, especially when applied outside their original intended milieu. Therefore, to insure its ability to be replicated across institutional contexts, this chapter attempts to quantify what writing fellow knowledge is, how writing fellows carry out their tasks, and how we may be able to evaluate the success of their efforts. It also suggests possibilities to not only enhance the knowledge-making process, but hints at the potential for in-depth assessment of progress along a continuum.

In the collaborative writing fellows relationships described in chapter 3, pairings were comprised of what Kuriloff (1992) would recognize as a "content

instructor"—the professor—and a "writing instructor" who was the writing fellow (Kuriloff, 1992). While this marked delineation of roles may have seemed commonsense to Kuriloff (as it was to her as she was attempting to negotiate these relationships) at the time, it serves to shut down any discussion of what assuming either of those roles implied. Discerning what denotes who serves as the content instructor seems obvious; they are faculty who teach undergraduate engineering, biology, meteorology, etcetera, and this is the knowledge they bring to the collaborative table. But trying to ascertain exactly what "content" a writing instructor, e.g. a writing fellow, contributes is a bit more elusive. If writing fellows implementations are to be successfully modeled from this enterprise, it is imperative that every attempt is made to first quantify the body of knowledge a writing fellow must have before they assume a collaborative WAC relationship. Without this important step, such WAC iterations will continue to focus on the participants' success or failure at establishing relationships without offering tools to help achieve mutual goals.

Resistance and Expertise

Given the nature of the writing fellows collaboration, being at once easy to understand but hard to define, establishing benchmarks for what a fellow should know is challenging. Having introduced the paradigm of faculty WAC acceptance continuum in previous chapters, it is important to note that this is correlated with a learning curve on the part of the writing fellow, with neither ever expected to reach the 100% mark. In his most recent research addressing writing consultancy, Jablonski (2006) prefers to put in taxonomy form by way of

explanation what the roles of faculty and consultant are, allowing no room for growth for either member of the partnership. And when he claims to inform the reader of "*what* the consultant knows and does", the reader is instead presented with models that describe the delimitations of the relationships (i.e. "service model", "reflective inquiry" model) without being given any real insight to what knowledge a consultant must have before embarking upon them (Jablonski, 2006, p. 102). Although he admits his taxonomic breakdown "was mainly a descriptive effort to synthesize various methods that have been developed and reported", it highlights how much more research is needed in this area. What a writing fellow "does" in a collaborative relationship (and indeed the methodology of almost all WAC implementations) is very similar to what has been occurring since its inception and varies only by degree. Goals and objectives are defined, criteria are established, papers are commented on, feedback is measured—all this and more, or perhaps less, are what writing consultants and their faculty colleagues are engaging, whether on workshop format or in one-on-one situations. If this is the case, all iterations of WAC that use this general model should be successful, but as commonsense would indicate, this is not always so. The variables comprised by the participants in the collaborative relationship have the largest confounding effect on the results achieved. From the aspect of a writing across the curriculum program director or the writing fellow, the faculty member must be accepted for where they are at on the continuum of WAC acceptance; forcing the issue may only increase resistance.

Mahala and Swilky (1994) posit that reluctance of faculty members at large doctoral-granting and research institutions to accept to WAC ideas is related to their perception of expertise within the disciplines. Teaching, for the faculty member, is one venue though which their expertise in the field is displayed. For a disciplinary instructor who views their own expertise in direct relation to the amount of accumulated knowledge they hold, that instructor may have difficulty acknowledging a writing fellow as a co-collaborator as opposed to a "service provider" (Mahala & Swilky, 1994, p. 39). Geisler (1994) also traces this phenomenon, noting that "the separation of knowledge production from knowledge use led to an internal stratification…into academic and practitioner" with the role of practitioner being devalued in the dichotomy (p. 74). Writing and composition does not, in the view of the disciplinary faculty, have a knowledge production base, facilitating their utilization of the "services" provided by the fellow. To stem this impulse and in an effort to provide real assistance to the professor while challenging him or her to move slightly beyond their comfortability zone, the writing fellow must have an quantifiable expertise to bring to the collaborative relationship. Shulman's (1989) notion of pedagogical content knowledge—the combination of a content expertise and a deep understanding the development of context-appropriate teaching methods—speaks to the background a writing fellow needs to have. The first and most essential knowledge a writing fellow must cultivate is of genre because, as argued by Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas N. Huckins (1995), "written communication functions within disciplinary cultures to facilitate the multiple social interactions

that are instrumental in the production of knowledge" and doing so will forge a sense of alliance (Berkenkotter & Huckins, 1995, p. 1). The writing fellow must demonstrate a knowledge of genres pertinent to the specific disciplinary culture as they facilitate the confidence required of the faculty partner to move the relationship further down the continuum to greater acceptance.

The "Content Knowledge" of the Writing Fellow: Genre

In many WAC narratives, including those of the writing fellow in these chapters, have the gathering of course materials as an initial step and essential component of the engagement. Assignments are analyzed, as are student writing samples, lecture notes, scholarly articles, and other texts relating to the course (for instance the wiki in the second collaboration narrative). The skilled writing fellow takes these texts, the input of their faculty collaborator and/or teaching assistants, and personal observations to form their genre knowledge, defined by Berkenkotter and Huckins (1995) as the "situated cognition" that is embedded in the context of the discipline (p. 3). Genre knowledge is key to deeper engagement in a writing fellows collaboration because it helps build common ground with disciplinary faculty and speaks to both levels of the relationship's goals: practical and meta. Using their knowledge of how texts function within a discipline, the writing fellow acts to mediate and bridge the instructor's deep genre understanding (which is oftentimes transparent to them)[21]

[21] David Russell points out that the "transparency of writing masks that the rules of the game are, in many ways, rhetorical; written discourse plays an important (at some points crucial) role in professional advancement. And the whole system depends upon disciplinary boundaries that are, in varying degrees, established and maintained rhetorically through the unique discursive activity of each community" (p. 29). (Russell, 2002)

[22] with their students' more tenuous grasp of disciplinary conventions. The writing fellow may serve as a facilitator for better understanding of assignments by students via existing course materials, as in the geology course scenario, or be instrumental in creating new classroom implementation, such as the course wiki in the second scenario. Both collaborative faculty partners were pleased with the results of efforts, regardless of how much they accepted WAC ideology as a whole; this increases their likelihood of continuing their involvement with WAC initiatives, which then deepens the penetration of WAC into the department.

Understanding the conventions of the selected discipline, or genre knowledge, allows a writing fellow greater access because these conventions play a gate-keeping function as opposed to being a benign means of organizing information. Harriet Malinowitz (1998) articulates a warning against WAC endeavors simply reproducing disciplinary ideals that serve this function:

> Characterized by a fealty to both subject and method, the disciplines don't simply describe knowledge, they legitimate it by creating zones of acceptable scholarship that effectively bracket out all that is not already the progeny of those zones and codes. (p. 291)[23]

[22] Or while they are aware that teaching disciplinary writing involves certain processes, the processes themselves remain difficult for them to articulate. The professor in the second scenario noted in her comments "While I would say that most of the meteorology faculty and lecturers somehow learned how to write a paper over the years by reading other papers and passing through peer review processes, we do not necessarily know how to **explain** why certain styles are good and others are not. At least I myself realized that I often intuitively consider something as good or bad writing style without really knowing how to explain to the students why it is like that."

[23] Bekenkotter and Huckins concur, noting "[disciplinary] frameworks leave little conceptual space for a reflective agent. Rather [the agent] is seen as something of a sociological dope who knows little of the institutions working in the background" (p.17).

The writing fellow has an ambiguous insider/outsider status allowing him or her to subtly interrogate what have become disciplinary norms. The meetings with the faculty member and teaching assistants in the second scenario about student access to the wiki led to a far-ranging discussion about the mutable balance between allowing greater student access and protecting the integrity of the course. Contained within the notion of course integrity, however, is the function of gate keeping, institutional as well as disciplinary, and it is a fact of life within the university, especially in highly competitive fields like meteorology or petroleum engineering. Therefore, as we negotiated the boundaries of student access to the course wiki, we were also interpreting how technology affects ideas of who creates, controls, and legitimizes knowledge within the field. From my faculty collaborator's and teaching assistants' point of view, they could control student access and course integrity, their overt intent, while maintaining tight control over knowledge production, a less explicit, but always- present concern. I learned a great deal about how the unforeseen (from my background as an instructor of composition) anxiety about maintaining integrity in disciplinary knowledge production was also tied to institutional legitimization.

In the best-case scenario a writing fellow will bring a wealth of knowledge and experiences concerning all the genres they might encounter in their collaborative relationships. To build this knowledge base requires exposure because genre knowledge "rather than being explicitly taught, is transmitted through enculturation", and becoming "socialized" to specific disciplinary conventions means having to actually work with and interrogate the texts

((Berkenkotter & Huckins, 1995, p.7). For these reasons it is very valuable for a writing fellow to possess a background as a writing center consultant experience because a personal knowledge base grows only through repeated exposure to a variety of disciplinary texts. Also developed through writing center practice and essential to efficacious writing fellows implementations is the practical knowledge of working one-to-one to collaborate on writing-based activities. Teaching writing also involves the logistic implementation of effective writing assignments but to classrooms comprised of undergraduates. Although some would claim "the WAC movement has consisted argued for a view of writing considerably at odds" with first-year composition, it would instead seem that composition provides a theoretical foundation as well orientation toward a process method invaluable to WAC (Runciman, 1998, p. 51). This does not indicate that WAC initiatives out of necessity must be based out of, staffed, or maintained by English department. To the contrary, this suggests the portability of composition methodology has much broader application across the university they may have been previously thought; not a startling proposition considering the history that has been presented. Composition, as a discipline, drew from a broad range of fields to form its foundation; as writing fellows expand in serving the university community, its methods with emphasis on procedural knowledge, reflection and recursiveness provide an underpinning.

The "Content Knowledge" of the Writing Fellow: Writing Process

Composition brings an emphasis on pedagogical practices to the collaborative table that other disciplines, focused on content knowledge, do not

have. As traced in earlier histories, composition's theoretical development as a discipline coincided with a period of social and cultural upheaval that guided the teaching of writing away from current-traditional or skills-and-drills models. Similar to the real experience that writing center consultation provides a writing fellow, composition's attention to pedagogy also focuses on the procedural knowledge[24] that is often overlooked within other disciplines. Many of the classroom techniques advocated by writing fellows during their semester-along engagements are based in composition pedagogy, such as "small group discussion has become a staple…[and] even more common…is the practice of peer response to writing: students each draft an assigned paper, and then classmates respond to and make suggestions for improving the draft" (Moore Howard, 2001, p. 54). These types of activities have students creating and then interrogating disciplinary knowledge collaboratively; using peer review and a series of drafts as suggested here is also a common way to introduce writing as a process. In the first scenario, the professor offered a series of drafts but undercut the perceived benefit to the students by implying those who actually *needed* more than one draft to write the paper were somehow deficient. While he may have borrowed the multiple-draft technique from composition, it was used in name only and the method of its implementation ran counter to its intention.

The process method places value on the recursive nature of writing, as opposed to the final product that is the written text, and downplays errors

[24] Procedural knowledge as defined by George Hillocks Jr. as "activities involving the manipulation or generation of [content knowledge] amount[s] to procedural knowledge related to discourse" (p. 29)

committed along the way as a natural part of revision. Sondra Perl's (1980) look at inexperienced writers in 1980 challenged the views purported in particular by cognitivists that writing was a straightforward linear process. After observing inexperienced writers struggle with revision, she concluded:

> Writing is a recursive process…throughout the process of writing, writers return to substrands of the overall process, or subroutines (short successions of steps that yield results on which the writer draws in taking the next set of steps); writers use these to keep the process moving forward. In other words, recursiveness in writing implies that there is a forward-moving action that exists by virtue of a backward-moving action. (p. 364)

Nancy Summers (1980) concurred in her research published also that year[25] and added that less experienced writers are stymied in part by the ill-advised revision choices that they make based on local, instead of global, concerns:

> The students have strategies for handling words and phrases and their strategies helped them on a word or sentence level. What they lack, however, is a set of strategies to help them identify the "something larger" that they sensed was wrong and work from there. The students do not have strategies for handling the whole essay. They lack procedures or heuristics to help them reorder lines of reasoning or ask questions about their purposes and readers. (p. 383)

The conclusions reached by Perl (1980) and Sommers (1980) have profound implications on implementing via WAC writing process methods developed in composition.[26] It is apparent that the aforementioned professor believed he was helping his students by accepting the first draft and relegating multiple drafts to those who "need" it. However, by accepting some drafts and rejecting the rest,

---

[25] In fact in the same issue (Vol. 31, no. 3) of College Composition and Communication as Perl, which was themed, similarly to that year's conference, "Writing: The Person and the Process." The issue also contained Mike Rose's cognitive process analysis. Whereas the notion of recursitvity in writing would become a foundational component of the process method, the cognitivist approach would eventually wane in popularity.

[26] See also Mina Shaughnessey's *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for Teachers of Basic Writing* (1977) and "The Study of Error" by David Batholomae (1980).

the professor missed important teachable moments, due to not recognizing the texts were not only unfinished papers, in many ways they represented thoughts that were not fully articulated. The writing fellow's knowledge of the composing process may help to intervene in scenarios where the faculty collaborator is in the "purchase model" mode, i.e. accepting of general WAC ideology but still resistant to measures that lead to anything other than superficial change. This also constitutes a teachable moment for the collaborative pair. Because of the inability to separate the difference in the type of errors his students make, it becomes difficult for the geology professor to determine if students' papers are poor because of a lack of content understanding or if their inexperience at writing for geology impedes them from conveying their ideas. Transforming this into a context where the students' evince good writing that conveys correct thinking, requires two steps: interceding in the drafting process at the appropriate time and correctly interpreting the type of error. Sommers (1980) refers to this as "seeking discovery in dissonance" (p. 387)[27]

The writing fellow helps to "sell" the idea of constant intervention into the students' writing process by the professor as a means of fulfilling two functions: to keep the students on track in the progression of their writing and reducing the possibility of plagiarism, a concern in highly competitive disciplines.[28] A series of low-stakes, but assessable, writing assignments are given to students at crucial

[27] Perl preferred to avoid the term "discovery" as used here by Sommers because it may "lead us to think that meaning exists fully formed inside of us and that all we need do is dig deep enough to release it" (p. 351). Her demur is partially because this correlates closely as well to the objectivist view of knowledge the hard sciences tend to hold.
[28] When presenting new implementations to a faculty member, many times in their view, it becomes a matter of cost/benefit analysis. If the professor perceives a loss of time that could be spent covering course content, an incentive for participation must be offered in return

points during the writing process; these can be graded on a check/no-check basis and included in the point total for the assignment. Such writing assignments could include: composing research questions; summarizing salient scholarly articles; preparing an annotative bibliography; or writing the introductory paragraph. By evaluating the paper trace of documents, it is far easier for an instructor to intercede in the student's writing process when they see something has gone awry, rather than try to retroactively deal with a problem when the paper has already been written. What most composition instructors already know and what writing fellows teach their disciplinary faculty colleagues is that it is both more expedient and efficacious to deal with issues in student writing during the ongoing process than to respond to a completed paper with commentary in hopes it will change the next time.

Requiring students to provide the aforementioned and other forms of documentation to provide a trace of their writing activities also constitutes a method of guarding against plagiarism; if students have to provide evidence of performing research and submit writing at various stages, they are far more likely to complete the assignment without incident. Rebecca Moore Howard (2001), a compositionist who has written extensively on plagiarism issues argues that:

> We beg our students to cheat if we assign a major paper and then have no further involvement with the project until the students turn in their work. Assigning and grading a paper leaves out a crucial middle: working and talking with students while they draft those papers. (Moore Howard 2001)

If the instructor believes (or can be coaxed to see) that a large percentage of plagiarism is due to students unpreparedness, the opportunity is there for the

writing fellow to instigate a significant pedagogical shift. The skill of the writing fellow at this point is to persuade reticent faculty that: 1) content knowledge may be effectively transmitted through working with students and their writing; and 2) the time spent with students on the early stages of an assignment pays dividends evinced through better papers, with the understanding that a well-written paper is indicative of disciplinary concept comprehension. Current research, such as by Carter, Ferzli, and Weibe (2007) supports the notion that “by asking students to write these apprenticeship genres, we provide opportunities for socialization into the disciplines by encouraging them to enact broader ways of knowing associated with membership in the disciplines” (p.296).

The Writing Fellow as a Practitioner

The talent necessary of a writing fellow to negotiate the subtle or sometimes contentious vagaries of a collaborative faculty relationship is a type of knowledge that is more challenging to quantify. It is the information about how the writing fellows performs what he or she does. It is a given certain WAC-related collaborative activities will take place during a writing fellows engagement, but the context of each relationship is unique owing to the personalities of the participants. Throughout this work, it is made clear that the existence of variance in writing fellow relationships predetermines the success of each venture, so issues of sustainability hinge on defining features of writing fellows practice. The content knowledge of the writing fellow, genre and writing process, is not comparable to their faculty collaborator in the usual sense; unlike a periodic table of elements or measurements on a weather gauge, it cannot be

committed to memory for retrieval as needed. The writing fellow assumes the role of *practitioner* or one who “acts on the basis of what he or she knows but without separating the intellectual from the practical” and makes decisions based on accumulated knowledge and situational and relational context (Hillocks, 1999, p. 127). Often the practitioner is confronted with a “situation [that] doesn’t fit a practitioner’s existing knowledge—which is often the case”, and must react in line with the overall objectives of the partnership (Jablonski, 2006, p. 113). Such instances often arise unexpectedly, and in the case of writing fellows “we act on what we believe to be desirable and what we think are the means for bringing about the desirable end, but without necessarily thinking each of these through as we might at a time when action is not immediately demanded” (Hillocks, 1999, p. 127). To a large degree then, the knowledge of practice maintained by a writing fellow is contextually unique and derived partially from response to situational demands as they arise.

To make sense of current challenges, writing fellows as practitioners rely on a background of experience from which to draw inferences; Schön (1987) points out that “although we sometimes think before acting, it is also true that in much of the spontaneous behavior of skillful practice we reveal a kind of knowing which does not stem from prior intellectual operation” (p. 50). When barriers arise in a collaborative relationship, they will be unique and contingent upon the participants; the writing fellow engenders to interact with the situation and influence it in process with each choice made. In resonance with past experience the writing fellow edits his or her course of action with a “continuing

evaluation of the unfolding events of the process: a continuing evaluation of his or her moves in terms of their results, their conformity with earlier goals and moves, and new problems that arise" (Hillocks, 1999, p. 128). In an attempt to construct an "epistemology of practice" for writing fellows work, the link between past experiences and present situational exigency should be thoroughly explicated (D.A. Schön, 1991, p. 5).

"The Reflective Turn"

How does a writing fellow as practitioner make sense of every new situation and respond in ways that are in accordance with goals already in place? The most important function in an epistemology of practice is what Schön (1991) identifies as the "reflective turn" or "reflection on the understandings already built into the skillful actions of everyday practices" (p. 5) This would suggest that while a skillful practitioner will indeed make in-the-moment decisions, they will also reflect on those choices and weigh their appropriateness at a time removed from the situation, allowing the practitioner to draw more deeply from their accumulated knowledge. An example of this type of reflective activity may be seen with the professor and teaching assistants from the second scenario. Modeling the type of writing we desired for the first assignment seemed to be the best approach because it was so challenging to describe we wanted; it was far easier to "show" the students than tell them. My initial suggestion to retrofit the writing assignment with a modeling exercise based on the original reading was

well-received by the professor who volunteered class time the following Monday for its presentation to the class. At that time in the meeting with the professor and the teaching assistants, the modeling exercise, an approach I had used many times in other classrooms, appeared to be the most appropriate instructional method.

However, when removed both geographically and temporally from the immediate demands of the meeting, I took time to reflect upon our intended course of action and noticed a flaw in my planning. While we had students generate papers for the assignment, which we read but did not grade, none of the papers from the first iteration would be accepted; all the students were to revise per the modeling session and resubmit. Nothing was going to be done with those first papers. But overlapping backgrounds as a writing consultant and as a composition instructor would insist that it is imperative to value student texts; this is important for two reasons. First, in the world of academe, students texts are sometimes viewed as disposable or of no consequence—to use student texts as the centerpiece of a pedagogical strategy would elevate their importance. For students, to have representative members of the academy recognize their writing and use it for even greater learning opportunities validates their knowledge, even in its nascent form. Secondly, if operating on the assumption that students texts are intrinsically important, something always must transpire with student writing—students should never be compelled to produce writing with no purpose. If a each class member in good faith completes an assignment, the instructor must honor that intention by making the writing meaningful through either assessment

or a learning opportunity. Once we had asked students to put their best effort into the writing assignment, we as instructors were obliged to use that undertaking productively. While that was not apparent to me in the context of the meeting, it became very clear upon reflection; to stay in concert with my meta goals regarding WAC ideology, we had to utilize the student texts for learning opportunities.

The reflective turn provided a moment when a bridge could be built between experiential knowledge—the initial type of modeling exercise performed many times before—and what comprises a writing fellow's content knowledge—composition process theory, which valorizes student texts, in a manner that entirely new knowledge (manifested as a new strategy) was formed. The specific writing fellow expertise became more apparent after reflection; not only was a new strategy suggested, it was compelled by deeper theoretical consideration of a solution that, in the moment, was acceptable. While the pedagogical approach agreed upon in the meeting was sound (because it had arisen from past experiences), reflection on past theoretical foundations influenced a reconsideration of the implementation. Kathleen Yancey (1998) emphasizes combining past and present views to present a larger comprehension:

> Reflection is *dialectical* putting multiple perspectives into play with each other in order to produce insight. Procedurally, reflection entails a *looking forward* to goals we may attain, as well as a *casting backward* to see where we have been. When we reflect, we thus *project* and *review*, often putting the projections and reviews in dialogue with each other, working dialectically as we seek to *discover* what we know what we might learn and what we might understand. (p. 6)

All elements of the triad structure are essential in the formation of new knowledge and speak to the overarching goals; this would be both the practical objectives of the instructor and in the case of writing fellows, the meta goals of facilitating WAC penetration. The multilayered nature of WAC objectives demand that a responsive mode of implementation is used; through reflective practice a writing fellow is able to achieve this type of flexibility.

The end result was a classroom activity grounded in both theory and practice that elicited a very positive response as evinced both through class participation and the quality of the papers. The faculty team member and teaching assistants at first were skeptical as to the appropriateness of the modeling and feared the students would be put off or embarrassed at the use of their own texts. As I anticipated, quite the opposite occurred, and students were far more engaged with the modeling than if we were using a dry disciplinary tome. Jablonski (2006) posits that strategically subverting usual disciplinary procedures may enhance the writing fellow's status as an "outsider" who can view situations unfettered by situational clutter and simultaneously an "insider" who encourages a co-collaborators confidence (p. 113).

Capturing Reflection-in-Action

As a practitioner of reflection, the writing fellow learns to think, plan, and implement while simultaneously considering past and future actions with a mind toward multilayered and interrelated goals; maximizing the efficacy and transferability of this model speaks to the success of future implementations.

And its resonance with models from writing pedagogy, such as the process model, indicates an appropriateness for the writing fellows endeavor; in fact, similar to process writing pedagogy "reflection-in-action is thus recursive and generative—it is not either a process/or a product, it is both processes *and* product" (Yancey, 1998, p. 24). Similar to how the writing fellow suggests the use of process pedagogy in the disciplinary classroom to help create new content knowledge, reflection-in-action, the process by which writing fellow practitioner knowledge is formed, can boost its pedagogical component by adding the element of reflective writing. The writing fellows scenarios depicted in chapter 3 were reconstructed (many months after the fact) only through the utilization of copious notes. My writings included the salient points of events: who attended the meetings; what assignment we discussed; how responsibilities were delegated; and logistics for the next class/meeting, but also had my immediate impressions of the situational aspects. I would note impressions I had of the setting or atmosphere, behavioral observations, and questions I wanted to ask the next time.[29] Since, however, these notes were compiled after the meeting took place, I practiced reflection to re-summon them for the composition process and thought through them again as I wrote them down. In addition, via the process of composing this research, the notes were then viewed again from a more distant point provoking even greater (and with each subsequent iteration,

[29] Many times I would note the affect of my co-collaborators at the time of the meeting; this would be subject to review at a later time removed from their immediate presence. Often professors would seem rushed or irritated that upon reflection probably concerned matters which had no bearing on me or the writing fellows project. The nature of the writing fellows relationship indicates the importance of this step so as not to misinterpret intention on the part of co-collaborators, but the onus is on the writing fellow to do this, not the faculty member to be clear.

deeper) reflection. Schön (1987) concurs noting "it is one thing to be able to reflect-in-action, it is quite another to be able to reflect upon our reflection-in-action to produce a good verbal description of it; and it is still another thing to reflect on the resulting description" (p. 31). A complex but intuitive process of reflection can be codified and recorded for greater reflection enhanced by being geographically and temporally removed from the original event.

Extensive use of notes during the first implementation with the geography professor (as reflected in the first scenario) helped me greatly as a writing fellow, especially since my faculty partner was rather reserved. Composing the notes as well as the subsequent construction of the scenario provided the reflection needed to deepen understanding of key elements in lieu of the facilitative dialogue of a supportive partner. The keeping of such notes in the form of a log or journal has precedent across the disciplines, in particular for students, used as an inducement to more focused reflection. Journals are an integral part of Fulwiler's approach, whether in the WAC faculty workshop (Fulwiler, 1981) or the English classroom (Fulwiler, 1980) where participants in both use journal-style, self-reflective writing techniques. In Young and Fulwiler's WAC workshop, they ask

> [participants] to keep a journal—an organized place for day-to-day expressive writing—and we ask them to write in a variety of ways to themselves about the content and the process of the workshop. At times we ask them to brainstorm in the journal, other times to summarize what they've learned, and still other times to reflect how they *feel* about the work of the workshop. (Fulwiler, 1986, p. 25)

In Fulwiler's (2002) narrative[30] about using write-to-learn[31] techniques in the classroom, the reader is introduced to a assistant professor in history who "believes passionately in the power of journals to generate, shape, and record thinking" as well to discipline intellectual habits and wants to share these benefits with his students (p. 5). Effective journaling reflects the best features of the scenarios above in that it is focused and multidimensional in its approach.

Journaling also has multidisciplinary applications; although Fulwiler comes from a background of English and the language arts, journaling techniques have been incorporated into diverse fields.[32] In the business world, reflective journaling comes as a natural progression of integrating the reflective practitioner model articulated by Schön as a means of avoiding the potential damage of unexamined leadership practices. As Lawrence (2007) argues, in the world of business, people in positions of leadership have too much at stake, in the form of other's lives, the health and reputation of the organization, etcetera, to refrain from critical self-reflection. Those who guide WAC implementations make crucial decisions that have implications for many; it is vital they are informed by critical self interrogation to avoid drawing from an "intuitive, non-reflective, and

[30] "The Misbegotten Journal of Dennis Wong" from *The WAC Casebook: Scenes for Faculty Reflection and Program Development,* Chris M. Anson, Ed. pp.3-5.

[31] "Writing to learn pedagogy encourages teachers to use writing as a *tool* for learning as well as a test for learning" (italics added) It is worth noting that write-to-learn genres, such as journals, are typically not assessed or very low stakes to encourage exploration, reflection, and discovery. McLeod, S. (2001). The pedagogy of writing across the curriculum. In Tate, G. Rupiper, A. and Schick, K. (Eds.) *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies* pp.149-164. New York: Oxford UP.

[32] Journaling as a method has been used and researched in the humanities and social sciences: "Confronting Aging and Serious Illness through Journaling: A Study of Writing as Therapy" (Lucie, 2008); second language learning: A Mutual Learning Experience: Collaborative Journaling between a Nonnative- Speaker Intern and Native Speaker Cooperating-Teacher (Gephard, 2006); and even mathematics: "Math Learning through Electronic Journaling" (Wolffe,1998) to name just a few instances.

…uninformed knowledge base” (Weimer, 2001, p. 47). Journaling can be promoted as a way to focus reflection in a critical manner on areas of pedagogy, practice, and content knowledge to facilitate engagement between writing fellows and their faculty co-collaborators.

The Potential for Assessment

While journaling in the language arts developed from Britton’s expressivist[33] theories, such writing in the form of journals, casebooks, or logs is prevalent in business to develop texts to be read by other audiences other than the author (Lawrence, 2007). Focused, critical reflective writing may form the basis of new knowledge to be shared between co-collaborators in a manner that enriches partnerships and informs fresh strategies. Moreover, documentation of the process of the collaborative relationship also presents unique possibilities for a type of assessment that addresses the degree of faculty growth and development along a continuum of WAC acceptance. While assessment of WAC programs continues to defy easy solutions[34] primarily because of the broad range of stakeholders involved as well the temptation to break assessment down to its component parts, it is necessary to inform future practice. Evaluation of the success of WAC programs is essential to guide future implementations and should not be looked upon as an intrusion but rather as an aid. Moreover, it seems necessary to separate evaluation of faculty-based WAC models from

[33] Expressivism holds the writer to be the center of importance and encourages writer self-actualization.
[34] See Condon, W., (2001). Accommodating complexity: WAC program evaluation in the age of accountability. In McLeod, S., Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C., (Eds.) *WAC for the New Millennium* pp. 28-51. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

those geared at students because determining the best *long-term* methods of sustainability center around faculty, and as noted by Condon (2001) "WACs very complexity demands complex forms of assessment" (p. 47).

The Case for Portfolio Assessment

Portfolios and their use for assessment purpose is well-documented for student writing (Elbow & Belanoff, 1986; Estrem, 2004), but less research has been performed concerning their use in evaluating program effectiveness. And while Jablonski (2006) suggests portfolios as a means of faculty assessment[35], he perceives it as a viable solution for justifying the consultant's position in the academy. Weaknesses discovered through evaluative processes point to areas for improvement, so it is vital to have a method for organizing any type of written reflective documents generated in WAC writing fellow collaborations. In grades K-12, the portfolio imparts validity "as a credential, as a set of assumptions about teaching and learning, and as making possible a powerful, personal reflective learning experience" (Lyons, 1998, p. 4). A symbiotic relationship should exist between documentation for assessment and that performed for the purpose of self-reflection; in an ideal context, they will form a comprehensive dialectic that reveals the growth processes of the individual.

Both the faculty collaborator and the writing fellow should compile a portfolio, and to utilize its most appealing feature—that it provides a depth across time—a number of different documents should be included. Similar to Boyer's

[35] See also Boyer's (Boyer, 1990) groundbreaking research on academic life in which he is "impressed by the portfolio idea—a procedure that encourages faculty to document their work in a variety of ways" (p. 40)

model for faculty self-assessment, the portfolios should include "a discussion of class goals and procedures, course outlines, descriptions of teaching materials and assignments" as well as a more reflective analysis of "impressions of the gains and losses,…what worked well, [and] what barriers were encountered" (Boyer, 1990, p. 37). In all the scenarios presented in chapter three, multiple drafts of course document were generated, and all are considered appropriate for inclusion in the portfolio. Through tracking the various iterations a document undergoes, changes in thinking in either member of the collaborative team will be tracked and preserved for analysis at a later date. In the first scenario, the original assignment sheet for the Rift paper was sparse in its information and confusing in its presentation because the first items presented were all formatting issues of minor

consequence:

Requirements:

- A Microsoft Word document.
- 1 inch margins (top, bottom, left, right).
- Font: Arial or Helvetica, 11 pt.
- Line spacing: Double.
- Length: Text of no less than 20 pages and no more than 25 pages. Diagrams (from the two papers) to follow the text.

Figure 1. Original assignment sheet requirements

However, after working together to revise and expand the assignment sheet, the final iteration evinced far more detail to queue students and presented it first to emphasize its importance. At my urging, the professor filled in what he denoted as the "Layout" of the paper with specifics on what he actually expected to find:

- Layout:
  - Abstract (a brief summary of what's in your paper – the last thing you write)
  - Introduction (sets the overall, regional scene).
  - Geology
  - Geophysics
  - Diagrams (no more than six; each diagram with a caption).
  - References Cited (it will only be the two papers!).

Figure 2. Paper "Layout" before revision

Layout:

- Abstract
  A brief (one paragraph) summary of what's in your paper. This is the last part of the paper that you write
- Introduction
  Sets the overall scene. In the context of this paper that means the relationship of your specific area to the Rio Grande Rift setting.
- Geology
  Descriptive and factual. For example, if you're dealing with a volcanic field, what are the dimensions (area) of the field; how many scoria cones in the field; what type of lava flows (aa and/or pahoehoe); how thick are the flows? Etc., etc.
- Petrology
  Descriptive and factual. What are the rock types? What is the mineralogy, and mineral compositions, of the rock types? What are the textures of the rock types?
- Geochemistry
  Descriptive and factual. What are the major and trace element and isotope (Sr; Nd; Pb) compositions of the rock types? How variable are these compositions? How do the compositions compare to other similar rock types in the rift? Outside of the rift?
- Discussion
  "Putting it all together": Interpretations and models that integrate and explain the factual data in the previous three sections. If there is more than one model for the origin of the rocks in your area, then discuss the relative merits of the various models.
- Conclusions
  What is the best explanation for the geology, petrology, and geochemistry of the rocks in your area in terms of igneous and tectonic processes?
- Diagrams and Tables
  Select some diagrams that you consider to be most relevant to the topic; use your own figure numbers and write your own captions for the diagrams, citing the source. Make sure that you reference and discuss the diagrams in the text of the paper.
  You will also need to include one or more tables of geochemical data. Again, you will take this (with or without modification) from one, or more, of your sources. Use your own table numbers and write your own captions for the tables, citing the source of the data.
- References Cited
  Alphabetical, in the style used in the first paper.

Figure 3. Paper "Layout" after revision

At a glance, these documents track the change; combining them with self-reflective notes by both parties would provide a clear picture of the collaborative process and if the participants were working toward their respective goals.

It is important, however, to achieve maximum benefit that the self-reflective writings are ongoing throughout the duration of the collaborative relationship as established in the reflective practitioner model (D.A. Schön, 1983; D.A. Schön, 1987) to enhance the richness of the learning experience. In the second scenario, I suggested to my co-collaborator, a professor who had recently achieved tenure, that she compose notes throughout the process. We discussed methods for organizing the notes and what types of observations, etc. I recorded in my reflections as well as possible benefits to be gained, including that it would provide her with a document to refer to long after the collaboration had ended. She was very enthused about keeping a journal and hoped it would also help her, as a non-native English speaker, hone her writing skills. We agreed she would begin her writing immediately to parallel mine and continue throughout the duration of the semester; my director had provided a beautiful journal for just this purpose, which I presented to my faculty colleague. As gauged upon her interest, I anticipated my faculty collaborator's journal to be a smashing success, and I reminded her about maintaining it (as was part of our initial agreement) during the early part of the semester. But as I found my gentle inquiries were met with annoyance (though not directed at me), I realized time constraints were keeping from writing down her reflections. As would prove to be true with the professor I would be paired with during the upcoming semester, and though both were very interested in deeper engagement with WAC/writing fellows methods, neither faculty member felt they had adequate time to accomplish all they wanted with student writing. The constraint of time affects all

writing fellows relationships because it skews the relative degree of each participant's depth of involvement and in the end, faculty are deprived of a more effective WAC experience.

Writing and Professorial Priorities

The METR3163 scenario is probably the best representation of what challenges WAC initiatives right now in large institutions and the future potential for instigating lasting pedagogical change in how the disciplines utilize writing. Techniques such as reflective writing, journaling, and portfolio assessment fulfill multi-various goals and objectives of WAC programs by incorporating deep thinking, and constructive and recursive practices into a process model, which provides built-in tracking as well as enhanced understanding. This would seem to be the preferred implementation of WAC as reflected in both the comments of the professors as well as achievement of short term WAC meta goals that aim toward deeper penetration of WAC ideology into the meteorology department. The assignments implemented were successful and the collaborations were very productive; the issue that bubbled under every project and threatened to spill across all constraints was time. Everything connected to writing and the writing process seems by definition to require time, which sometimes could not be justified by disciplinary instructors when held in opposition to teaching content knowledge. However, looming larger were issues about professional obligations.

While the meteorology department was very interested as a group in incorporating WAC principals and bringing WAC staff into the department, individually, the demands of their professional lives made full participation difficult. The professor in the second scenario had recently achieved tenure and in the third was the department head; the situational context of their roles as faculty in a dynamic department served to place severe limitations on collaborative time spent.

Unfortunately, this reflects a common barrier to WAC implementation in contemporary research-oriented institutions: the role of faculty members since the turn-of-the-century adoption of the Germanic model is not one in which teaching holds the highest priority. On the contrary, "basic research has come to be viewed as the first and most essential form of scholarly activity" in these large universities as faculty strives to first achieve tenure then to maintain an overwhelming work load (Boyer, 1990, p. 15). Writing across the curriculum programs attempt to ameliorate the omission of writing from the disciplinary classrooms that first occurred when English departments were elected responsible for teaching students all-inclusive writing skills. As traced in the earlier portion of this work, when research and publication grew in importance in the modern university, the resultant increase in specialization held no one truly accountable for teaching students disciplinary genres, though English and subsequently first-year composition programs bore the blame. Writing across the program initiatives encourage faculty to use writing to strengthen learning strategies for disciplinary content and make them an integral part of their

pedagogical approach, so students learn to master the genres they will be using throughout their career. However, long-term success of WAC into the next decade and beyond hinges on a re-conceptualization of the modern university and its mission.

Moreover, for institutionalized higher education to remain relevant in the future its mission must be more responsive to its students and the community contexts of individual institutions. To many this means a return to teaching as a fundamental mission; Boyer (1990) first called for this reordering of priorities in response to the increasingly detached specialization of disciplinary faculty occurring in contemporary universities. He views it as so crucial that he suggests "the nation's ranking universities…extend special status and salary incentives to those professors who devote most of their time to teaching and are particularly effective in the classroom" (p. 58). The current economic climate only serves to reinforce the centrality of undergraduate education as an institutional mission; with many other higher education options available, the four-year, Research I university may be perceived as a poor cost-to-benefit choice. Community colleges, specialized degree programs, and online universities have the flexibility to cater to changeable students metrics, whereas larger institutions must draw from their greatest advantage: the ability to acquire the best intellectual talent. However, change will occur only when large, doctoral –granting institutions re-conceptualize their primary mission as not research but teaching, while both encouraging and rewarding their faculty to follow suit.

REFERENCES

About Arcardia. (2009). *Arcadia University* Retrieved May 27, 2009, from http://www.arcadia.edu/about/default.aspx?id=633

About the Program. (2009). *University of Wisconsin-Madison, Writing Fellows Program* Retrieved January 21, 2010, from http://writing.wisc.edu/wf/main.html

Anstendig, L. R., E. Young, S. Mosley, P. & Kirschstein, B. (2001, October 8). Architects of change: Writing enhanced course program development and core reform. *Across the Disciplines, 1*.

Bazerman, C., Little, J., Bethel, L., Chavkin, T., Foucette, D., & Garufis, J. . (2005). *Reference guide to writing across the curriculum*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Berkenkotter, C. H., T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication : Cognition/culture/power* Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates

Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale, IL: NCTE.

Bickford, C. (2007). Inside looking out: Trading immediate autonomy for long-term centrality. In W. M. M. McCauley, N. (Ed.), *Marginal Words, Marginal Work? Tutoring the Academy in the Work of Writing Centers* (pp. 135-150). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Boquet, E. H. (1999). "Our little secret": A history of writing centers, pre- to post-open admissions. *College Communication and Composition, 50*(3), 463-482.

Bowersox, H. C. (1955). The Idea of the Freshman Composition Course. A Polemical Discussion. *College Composition and Communication, 6*(1), 38-44.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative Learning and the "Conversation of Mankind". *College English, 46*(7), 635-652.

Bruffee, K. A. (1993). *Collaborative Learning: Higher Education, Interdependence, and the Authority of Knowledge* (Second ed.). Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Carleton College. (2009). *U.S.News and World Report* Retrieved May 27, 2009, from http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/college/items/2340

Carter, M., Ferzli, M., & Wiebe, E. N. (2007). Writing to Learn by Learning to Write in the Disciplines. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 21*(3), 278-302.

Central College. (2009). *U.S. News and World Report* Retrieved May 27, 2009, from http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/college/items/1850

Condon, W. (2001). Accommodating complexity: WAC program evaluation in the age of accountability. In S. H. McLeod, Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C (Ed.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the curriculum programs* (pp. 28-51). Urbana,Il: NCTE.

Covino, W. A. J., D.A. (1995). *Rhetoric: Concepts, definitions, and boundaries*. Needham Heights, MA Allyn and Bacon.

Crowley, S. (1998). *Composition in the university: Historical and polemical essays*. Pittsburgh, PA: UNiversity of Pittburgh Press.

Day, K. E., M. (2001). *(First person)^2 :A study of co-authoring in the academy* Logan, UT: Utah State U P.

Desai, A. (2009). In M. Carter (Ed.) (e-mail ed.). Oklahoma City, OK.

Ede, L. L., A. (1990). *Singular texts/plural authors:Perspectives on collaborative writing* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP.

Elbow, P., & Belanoff, P. (1986). Portfolios as a Substitute for Proficiency Examinations Source *College Composition and Communication, 37*(no. 3), 336-339.

Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a Mode of Learning. *College Composition and Communication, 28*(2), 122-128.

Eodice, M. (2007). Your Writing @ OU. Retrieved August 3, 2009, from http://www.ou.edu/writing/

Estrem, H. (2004). The Portfolio's Shifting Self: Possibilities for Assessing Student Learning. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture, 4*(1), 125-127.

Faigley, L., & Miller, T. P. (1982). What We Learn from Writing on the Job. *College English, 44*(6), 557-569.

Fitzgerald, K. (2001). A rediscovered tradition: European pedagogy and composition in nineteenth-century midwestern normal schools *College Composition and Communication, 53*(2 (Dec., 2001)), pp. 224-250

Flynn, E., McCulley, G. & Gratz, R. (1986). Writing in biology: Effects of peer critiquing and analysis on the quality of biology lab reports. In A. Young, Fulwiler, T. (Ed.), *Writing Across the Disciplines* (pp. 160-175). Upper Montclair, NJ Boynton/Cook Publ.

Freisinger, R. (1980). Cross-Disciplinary Writing Workshops: Theory and Practice. *College English, 42*(2 (Oct. 1980)), 154-156.

Fulwiler, T. (1980). Journals across the Disciplines. *The English Journal, 69*(9), 14-19.

Fulwiler, T. (1981). Showing, not telling, at a writing workshop. *College English, 43*(1), 55-63.

Fulwiler, T. (1986). The argument for writing across the curriculum. In A. F. Young, T (Ed.), *Writing across the disciplines: Research into practice* (pp. 21-32). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Fulwiler, T. (1986). Reflections: How well does writing across the curriculum work? In A. F. Young, T (Ed.), *Writing across the disciplines: Research into practice* (pp. 235-246). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Fulwiler, T., Gorman, M., & Gorman, M. . (1986). Changing faculty attitudes toward writing. In A. F. Young, T (Ed.), *Writing across the disciplines: Research into practice* (pp. 53-67). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

The function of the communication course in general education: The report of workshop 2. (1950). *College Communication and Composition, 1*(2), 2.

Geisler, C. (1994). *Academic literacy and the nature of expertise: Reading, writing, and knowing in academic philosophy*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ghodsee, K. (2008). A Research Career at a Liberal-Arts College. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(33), C1-C4.

Haring-Smith, T. (1992). Changing Students' Attitudes: Writing fellows programs. In S. H. S. McLeod, M. (Ed.), *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. 123-131). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publ.

Hillocks, G. (1999). *Ways of thinking, ways of teaching*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Jablonski, J. (2006). *Academic writing consulting and WAC: Methods and models for guiding cross-curricular literacy work*. Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Jones, R., & Comprone, J. J. (1993). Where Do We Go Next in Writing across the Curriculum? *College Composition and Communication, 44*(1), 59-68.
Kalmbach, J. R. (1986). The politics of research. In A. F. Young, T (Ed.), *Writing across the disciplines: Research into practice* (pp. 217-227). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Kozulin, A. (1986). Vygotsky in context (A. Kozulin, Trans.). In A. Kozulin (Ed.), *Thought and language* (pp. xi-lvi). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kuriloff, P. C. (1992). The writing consultant: Collaboration and team teaching. In S. H. S. Mcleod, M. (Ed.), *Writing Across the Curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. 32-46). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lawrence, P. (2007). Personal Reflective Writing in Business Communication and Managament. Unpublished Dissertation. University of Massachusetts-Amherst.

Lunsford, A. (1991). Collaboration, control, and the idea of the writing center. *The Writing Center Journal, 12*(1), 3-10.

Lyons, N. (1998). Portfolio possibilities: Validating a new teacher professionalism. In N. Lyons (Ed.), *With portfolio in hand: Validating a new teacher professionalism* (pp. 11-22). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Magnotto, J. N., & Stout, B. R. (1992). Faculty workshops. In S. H. S. Mcleod, M. (Ed.), *Writing Across the Curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. 32-46). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Mahala, D., Swilky, J., . (1994). Resistance and reform: The function of expertise in writing across the curriculum. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines, 1*(2), 35-62.

Maimon, E. P. (1992). Preface. In S. H. S. McLeod, M. (Ed.), *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. vii-i). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publ.

Maimon, E. P. (2001). Foreword. In S. H. McLeod, Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C. (Ed.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the curriculum programs* (pp. vi-x). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Malinowitz, H. (1998). A feminist critique of writing in the disciplines. In L. W. S.C. Jarrett (Ed.), *Feminism in Composition Studies: In Other Words* (pp. 291-312). New York, NY: Modern Language Association.

McLeod, S. H. (1992). WAC: An introduction. In S. H. S. McLeod, M. (Ed.), *Writing across the curriculum* (pp. pp. 1-11). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McLeod, S. H., & Emery, L. (1988). When Faculty Write: A Workshop for Colleagues. *College Composition and Communication, 39*(1), 65-67.
McLeod, S. H. M., E. (2001). Writing across the curriculum in a time of change. In S. H. McLeod, Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C. (Ed.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the curriculum programs* (pp. 1-27). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Moore Howard, R. (2001). Collaborative pedagogy. In G. Tate, Rupiper, A., & Schick, K. (Ed.), *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies* (pp. 54-70). New York, NY: Oxford.

Moore Howard , R. (2001). Forget about policing plagiarism: Just teach. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, The Chronicle Review Page*, B24.

Moore, R. H. (1950). The Writing Clinic and the Writing Laboratory. *College English, 11*(7), 388-393.

Mullin, J., & Schorn, S. (2007). Enlivening WAC programs old and new. *The WAC Journal, 18*(September), 13.

Mullin, J. A. (2001). Writing centers and WAC. In S. H. McLeod, Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C (Ed.), *WAC for the new millenium: Stategies for continuing writing across the curriculum programs* (pp. 179-199). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Oklahoma, U. o. (2008, September 2, 2008). A message to OU undergradutes--Philosphy of OU General Education. Retrieved August 2, 2009, from http://www.ou.edu/provost/pronew/content/pacgeo.html

Perl, S. (1980). Understanding Composing. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(4), 363-369.

President's Homepage. (2009). *Eastern Oregon University* Retrieved June 2, 2009, from http://www.eou.edu/pres/mission.html

Prior, D. (1998). *Writing/Disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Publ. Inc.

Program, T. U. W. F. (2005). The writing fellows faculty handbook
Retrieved January 21, 2010

Runciman, L. (1998). Ending composition as we knew it. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines, 2*(3), 10.

Russell, D. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. A. (1991). Introduction. In D. A. Schön (Ed.), *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice* (pp. 1-12). New York, NY Teachers College Press.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(4), 378-388.

Soven, M. (2001). Curriculum-based peer tutors and WAC. In S. H. McLeod, Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C (Ed.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the curriculum programs* (pp. 200-232). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Stanley, C. E. (1943). This Game of Writing: A Study in Remedial English. *College English, 4*(7), 423-428.

Stone, E. (2004). Liberal Arts: Vocation vs. Vocational. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(12), B5-B5.

Townsend, M. A. (2001). Writing Intensive Courses and WAC. In S. H. McLeod, Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C (Ed.), *WAC for the New Millenium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 238-258). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Vygotsky, L. V. (1986). Thought and language. In A. Kozulin (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Wallace, D. L. E., H.R. (2003). *Mutuality in the rhetoric and composition classroom*. Carbondale, IL: Southern IL.

Walvoord, B. E. (1992). Getting started. In S. H. S. Mcleod, M. (Ed.), *Writing Across the Curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. 12-31). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Walvoord, B. E., Hunt, L.L., Dowling, H.F., Jr., & McMahon, J.D. . (1997). *In the long run: A study of faculty in three writing-across-the-curriculum programs*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

WCU vision, mission & values statements. (2009). *West Chester University* Retrieved June 2, 2009, from http://www.wcupa.edu/_INFORMATION/FACTS.WCU/mission.htm

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wessley Publishing Company.
Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA Sage Publisher.

Weimer, M. (2001). Learning more form the wisdom of practice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 86*(Summer), 45-56.

Weiss, R., & Peich, M. (1980). Faculty Attitude Change in a Cross-Disciplinary Writing Workshop. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(1), 33-41.

West Chester University. (2009). *U.S.News and World Report* Retrieved June 2, 2009, from http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/college/items/3328

Writing, C. (2008). The University of Wisconsin Writing Center. Retrieved January 25, 2010, 2010, from http://writing.wisc.edu/Instructor/Instructor-Resources.html

Yancey, K. (1998). Reflection in the writing classroom

Young, A. (1986). Rebuilding community in the English department. In A. F. Young, T (Ed.), *Writing across the disciplines* (pp. 6-20). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Young, A., & Fulwiler, T. (1986). Evaluations: Assumptions and discoveries. In A. F. Young, T (Ed.), *Writing across the disciplines* (pp. 49-52). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publ. Inc.

Appendix 1.

Image capture of the METR3613 wiki

Student Survival Tips - METR 3613: Meteoro...

METR 3613: Meteorological Measurements

MaryCarter Settings Logout

Student Survival Tips

Search Titles Text

Main | Student Contributions2 | CategorySurvivalTips | Student Contributions | Student Survival Tips

Main | Glossary | Writing | **Student Survival Tips** | FAQ

METR3613 Student Survival Tips

Welcome to the wiki page devoted to student contributions to METR3613. From November 1st, 2008, until December 1st, 2008, the class can submit survival tips to earn up to five extra credit points per individual. These survival tips will be for future METR3613 students and should be in the form of brief bits of advice. Practicality, creativity, and overall quality of the written submissions will ultimately determine which will be permanently immortalized on the course wiki. From December 1st, 2008, until December 7th, 2008, students will be able to vote once on each submission via instant poll. The authors of each of the top 51% (of the total submissions) receiving the most "Yes" votes, in addition to having their entry accepted for permanent wiki inclusion, will receive one extra credit point, not to exceed five. ***Administrators reserve the right to disallow any submission***

Below is an example of a student survival tip as well the insta-poll. ***Actual insta-poll voting will be available December 1st***
[Sample] Be sure to attend the peer review help session because if you do, it will be easier to write the introduction to your midterm report.

- http://cartermary.wordpress.com/

You will need to register with the site in order to contribute. Click 'Login' at the top of the page and follow the link "If you do not have an account, you can create one now."

You will need to register using a username following the format FirstnameLastname (e.g. SeanArms, JoseGalvez).

The page Student Contributions is setup such that only students whose username follows the FirstnameLastname format will be able to participate. In order to aid in tracking contributions for the purpose of assigning extra credit points, please sign your contributions with your student id (not social security number, but student id). Keep in mind that edits are tracked using the wiki software to protect the integrity of student contributions.

1. Student Contributions

Student Survival Tips (last edited 2008-10-30 02:32:20 by SeanArms)

Edit (Text) Edit (GUI)
DeleteCache (cached 2008-10-30 02:32:21)
Or try one of these actions: AttachFile, DeletePage, Despam, LikePages, Load, LocalSiteMap, PackagePages, RenamePage, RenderAsDocbook, Save, SpellCheck, SubscribeUser, SyncPages

Appendix 2.

Faculty feedback: Associate professor of meteorology

<u>Brief Feedback to Mary Carter, writing fellow at OU's Writing Center, about our collaboration in METR3613 during Fall 2008</u>

Things that I really appreciated and that I consider important for a successful collaboration between a science lecturer and a writing fellow

Probably the most important thing was Mary's interest in understanding what kind of writing style is typical in meteorology and which style we really wanted the students to follow. I really appreciated that she did not push her own agenda but was open to listen, to read some meteorology journal articles, and to discuss with me and the TAs what we considered important for the students to learn and accomplish in METR3613.

The dialogues that we had about using new media technologies were quite eye-opening for me. I had not realized myself that media like blogs, or wiki websites could be used to get students more engaged in scientific writing. Even though it was not always easy to successfully integrate these ideas in my class (see below), the discussions that we had and the first steps that we took in using these technologies will be very helpful in the future.

Through my interactions with Mary, both individually and while offering joint help sessions in the class room, I have also learned how simple changes,

such as rephrasing questions, can promote student engagement in the classroom and stimulate discussions. With our science courses being so focused on delivering content we are not really trained to handle well sessions that have no clear agenda and in which the teacher mostly has to stimulate and lead a discussion. I can see how learning more about and adapting some of these techniques will be very useful in the classroom, not only with respect to writing, and also in other settings such as professional meetings.

I have also learned a lot about better balancing the efforts in providing feedback to the students about their writing. If an assignment is not graded or not worth a lot of points, the grading should also not be a big effort. Or in other words, it makes no sense to spend hours to provide each student individual feedback on their writing if the assignment does not count for much as they will probably not look at it. Such assignments can however still be very useful if feedback is provided in a different way, e.g. by conducting a peer review, and/or highlighting in the classroom some of the common mistakes and some of the things that we really liked. Mary's idea of pulling out nice sentences from different texts to form one "master" text that we then discussed in the classroom worked really well and students learned much more than from some cryptic feedback (and with 55 students individual feedback easily becomes cryptic!) written on each individual text.

Things that seemed to have the biggest impact on the students

- Having a person like Mary that (*sic*) is trained in English in the classroom conducting a peer review or providing any other feedback related to the writing assignments to the students has a big impact. First of all, students treat such person with a different respect than us science geeks, especially if you are a non-native English speaker like me. Why should they trust us that we know how to write well if we did not receive any formal training in it? And it does make a big difference if you actually have had such training. While I would say that most of the meteorology faculty and lecturers somehow learned how to write a paper over the years by reading other papers and passing through peer review processes, we do not necessarily know how to **explain** why certain styles are good and others are not. At least I myself realized that I often intuitively consider something as good or bad writing style without really knowing how to explain to the students why it is like that, while Mary could easily jump in and explain to the students what works and what does not.
- I think an important aspect of Mary's interactions with the students was that she realized that she is dealing with science oriented minds that might think a bit different than the students in a traditional English lecture. She seemed to find the right language in communicating with them without using a lot of what I will casually call "English jargon" which might easily turn away non-English majors.
- As I already mentioned above, Mary managed to make the writing help sessions more interactive and get the students more engaged in discussions. That certainly helped a lot.

o Her flexibility in accommodating the needs and schedules of the METR3613 students was a big plus too. She offered special times for the METR3613 students that they could come and see her in the writing center without making any reservations. I am not sure how many students actually used this great service but the ones that did clearly improved their writing styles.

2. Challenges that we faced

Starting the collaboration just at the beginning of the semester after the course syllabus and schedule was pretty much set in stone was clearly not ideal. In the future, the course syllabus and in particular the design of any writing oriented assignments and help session, should happen as a collaborative effort before the start of classes.

o The complexity of the class' writing assignments, with both lab and projects reports, was a bit challenging. Even though the instructions for the lab and project reports are already very similar, further improvements are necessary to better streamline the different assignments as this will not only reduce confusion from students but also allow a writing fellow to provide better feedback and get more involved in all aspects of the course.

o The interactions between the two Tas and Mary could have been slightly better. I think there is nobody to blame as all involved parties just got carried away by all their responsibilities once the semester was in full swing but that is certainly something that could be improved in the future.

- Having such a large class with 55 students makes it tricky to integrate assignments that better use some of the new media and are more interactive. We easily ran into problems such as making sure that students contributions can be posted anonymously, that we could monitor who/and what type of content was posted etc. The idea of the wiki website was great, particularly the interactive part that students have the option to post contributions on the wiki, but other technologies such as a blog might work better, and it will be necessary to further explore these options.
- A related challenge was that the current course management tool D2L is not ideal to set up peer reviews and it ended up being quite a lot of work administering a peer review through D2L. In the future we need to find ways to better manage the peer reviews.