Making WAC Accessible: Reimagining the WAC Faculty Workshop as an Online Asynchronous Course[1]

Amy Mecklenburg-Faenger, Park University
Brandi Handley, Park University
Emily Donnelli-Sallee, Park University

Abstract: As universities increasingly expand online education offerings, WAC directors are compelled to rethink how to make WAC training more available and accessible to a wider range of teaching personnel. In this article, we describe our unique institutional context as a liberal arts university heavily reliant on online education, and the features that can make implementing WAC at "unusual" institutions such as ours difficult—in particular, the training/support of geographically dispersed faculty teaching WAC courses in a variety of instructional modalities. We share the design of our four-week online asynchronous WAC faculty training course and present outcomes data from five cohorts that completed the course.

The WAC faculty workshop has long been a cornerstone of WAC programs across the United States. Thaiss and Porter's 2010 article summarizing the results of the national WAC/WID mapping project reported that the faculty workshop was the most common feature in WAC programs across the U.S. Their study showed that 78% of institutions with a WAC initiative reported having a WAC workshop and 87% of longstanding programs (those with 10 years or more under their belt) reported the same, suggesting that the faculty WAC workshop is an integral and crucial feature of established WAC programs. Guides for developing WAC programs point to the workshop as a critical space for developing "WAC values, encourag[ing] reflexive pedagogy, and foster[ing] faculty dialogue" (Magnotto & Stout, 2000, p. 33). However, many of the guides for developing WAC workshops do not address training in digital modes (though they may address *teaching* digitally), or do not address how to develop programs and workshops in institutions that vary significantly from the traditional, face-to-face teaching-focused institutions that are best represented in WAC literature.

According to the WAC/WID project, in 2010, WAC programs tended to be most common in large PhD and MA granting institutions and least common in community colleges (Thaiss and Porter, 2010). The 2020 update to the WAC/WID survey data generally confirms the 2010 findings, though community colleges gained some ground. Interestingly, online institutions still report very little WAC activity (Thaiss & Zugnoni, 2020). While the WAC/WID project did not make any finer distinction between types of institutions, Kurzer, Murphy, O'Meara, and Russo (2019) have compellingly argued that literature about WAC programs has largely bypassed "unusual" institutions, such as graduate-only universities, community colleges, technical schools, and others. This is not necessarily an intentional oversight on the part of WAC scholars, as WAC programs somewhat necessarily grew up in more traditional institutions (large state and/or or well-funded liberal arts colleges), which are more likely to have the faculty trained in rhetoric/composition and/or WAC, institutional structure, and funding needed to develop and sustain WAC programs. Furthermore, as Gardner (2010) argues in his introduction to a special issue of *Across the*

Across the Disciplines wac.colostate.edu/atd
A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing ISSN 554-8244
https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2022.18.3-4.03

Disciplines devoted to WAC in community colleges, beyond the problem of lesser representation in the WAC literature is the fact that WAC initiatives at less represented institutional types may not resemble more publicized types of programs, and thus may not be counted as WAC in national surveys (Gardner, 2010).

However, given the emergence of WAC initiatives at community colleges and smaller or more tuition-dependent universities, it is important to ensure that the literature reflects the diversity of institutional types within the WAC community. WAC models that can be translated to these kinds of institutions are important because such institutions often have administrative, budgeting, or other unique institutional features that may make implementation of WAC programs based on models drawn from large state universities very difficult. Kurzer et al. (2019) argue that we need examples of WAC implementation at more diverse or "unusual" institutions to help new WAC programs and directors find models suitable for their own institutions.

This point seems especially salient for universities like our own. A private liberal arts university with a residential flagship campus in the Midwest, along with multiple satellite campuses across the country offering degree completion programs for adult learners and a large online program, our institution relies upon a geographically dispersed network of adjunct or otherwise contingent faculty. Considering the growth of online education, the reliance on geographically proximal faculty may also be changing for many institutions, even those without satellite campuses. The Online Learning Consortium (OLC) reported in 2016 that the "number of students taking online courses grew to 5.8 million nationally, continuing a growth trend that has been consistent for 13 years. More than a quarter of higher education students (28 percent) are enrolled in at least one online course." That trend has further accelerated given the massive shift to online education during the COVID-19 crisis.

While WAC scholars have written about how WAC programs could work with emerging digital technologies and networked environments, they largely have focused on how this affects WAC teaching, rather than WAC faculty training and attendant institutional dynamics related to faculty support. Cox, Galin and Melzer (2018) observe that "[i]n WAC literature, theory tends not to focus on the complexities of higher education, but, rather, on the writing pedagogies that are at the heart of WAC programs" (p. 8). By not addressing the underrepresented "complexities of higher education" present in institutions like ours, theoretical work in WAC risks sidestepping a worthy question of whether WAC pedagogy is inherently institutionally neutral. Furthermore, very little information exists on how to translate what is usually understood to be an intimate, voluntary, in-person faculty workshop into a standardized online, asynchronous experience that is able to reach a broad, geographically distant audience of instructors.

Important and potentially relevant work is being done among online writing instruction (OWI) scholars to address faculty training in writing courses because many OWI instructors are not available for on-campus training, including practices that might be usefully adapted for expanding access to WAC faculty training. In her paper "Faculty Preparation for OWI," Kastman Breuch (2019) discusses how best to train faculty to teach writing online. She observes, "[i]mmersion is an educational principle that suggests there is no better way to learn something than to be placed within its milieu" (p. 356). She argues that those instructors who will be teaching online benefit from professional development that takes place online and that models online teaching strategies that instructors can use in their own online classrooms. If we can safely assume that courses of all disciplines are increasingly being offered online, then Kastman Breuch's argument supports the importance of aligning the type of training faculty receive to the modality in which they will be teaching. As universities move increasingly toward online education, particularly in light of COVID-19, WAC directors need to rethink how to make WAC training more available and accessible for a wider range of teaching personnel and institution types.

Even prior to COVID-19, many institutions were making the move to online education as a way of increasing *student* access (and thereby enrollment), arguably with little attention to how to make

professional development, particularly in WAC, more accessible to *faculty*. Indeed, for many of us, our institution's decision to offer foundational courses within our writing programs—first-year writing seminars, for instance, and WID courses—was not part of a coordinated and intentional strategy to take the writing program online, yet the result is the same: a rapidly expanded, often accelerated, and most certainly complex context in which to perform work that we all believe is place-based, high-touch, and formative for both writing teacher and WPA. As Susan McLeod (2007) reminds us, for WAC directors and WAC programs, "context is all" (p. 8). What happens, then, to a WAC program when that context expands to include virtual and/or otherwise geographically dispersed writing instructors?

Purpose

Given the room in the WAC literature for perspectives from institutions such as ours, we wish to share our own asynchronous WAC faculty training course so that other programs with similar features can adopt, adapt, and critique it. It is our hope that sharing our experience spurs more conversation around institutions like ours and the implementation of WAC programs in such institutions.

In the rest of the article, we describe in more detail our institutional context and the unique features that make implementing WAC—in particular, the training and support of geographically dispersed faculty teaching WAC courses in a variety of instructional modalities (face-to-face, online, hybrid)— at "unusual" institutions like ours difficult. We describe the design of our four-week online asynchronous WAC faculty training course and present outcomes data from the five cohorts that have completed the course between its inception May 2019 and May 2020. We discuss our successes, failures, and future plans for the course for other programs to consider as they contemplate how their own WAC faculty training might be converted online to reach broader audiences. The rapid shift to online learning that swept the country due to COVID-19 portends a future in higher education where online teaching and learning is institutionalized at all types of colleges and universities. By sharing our experiences in a WAC program that moved online prior to COVID-19, we hope to support WPAs and WAC directors facing the responsibility to rethink traditional models of WAC faculty support.

Institutional Context

Founded in 1875, Park University is a private, regionally accredited liberal arts institution located in Parkville, Missouri, a suburb of Kansas City. Park University serves approximately 15,000 students annually in undergraduate and graduate programs. Providing open access to a liberal arts education, especially for those without financial means, was the motivating factor for Park's founding. Access and inclusivity have compelled an interesting growth model. The vast majority of Park students never experience the flagship campus or work directly with full-time faculty. Instead, these students participate in degree completion programs or full degree programs at 40 campus centers, largely on military installations, in 21 states and online. In the early 1990s, Park piloted its first asynchronous online course. At present, nearly 80 percent of our students take one or more online courses each academic year (equating to approximately 145,000 credit hours offered online each year), regardless of where the student is located. The University offers 47 fully online degree programs and 29 online minors and certificates, with an inventory of over 650 online courses. Providing such access has developed considerable diversity among the student population, with approximately 55 percent student representation from racial, ethnic, and cultural groups typically underrepresented in colleges and universities. Approximately 60 percent of our student body is serving in our country's military or is otherwise military affiliated. Park is also an open admissions institution, which means students enter with a wide range of writing skills and preparedness for college-level work.

It was commitment to access that launched Park into the online world far before its peers. The institution sought to devise a pathway for adult and military students to continue their degree completion progress through online courses despite personal and professional disruptions. Courses are offered in accelerated,

eight-week terms, online and at satellite campus centers. In many ways, institutional values of access and inclusivity formed the basis for adopting a highly consistent and scalable approach to off-campus instruction, sometimes referred to in the distance learning literature as the "enterprise model" (Lowenthal & White, 2009). In this model, the use of common course content is required of all faculty teaching courses in the accelerated face-to-face, online, or hybrid formats. As we go on to discuss, this "enterprise model" presents a number of unique challenges for WAC faculty training and program development.

Online courses at Park are developed using a standardized process, with a course designer (often, but not always, a full-time faculty member) and an instructional designer working together to develop a Learning Management System (LMS) course shell replete with outcomes, reading assignments, presentations, assignments, and assessments. After approval by the academic department, the LMS shell is duplicated across all sections of a given course and published for largely adjunct faculty to teach. With notable exceptions, the typical approach of the academic programs is to restrict editing rights to the departmentally approved course content so that adjunct and full-time faculty cannot alter or delete content. Faculty are encouraged to supplement courses with additional resources, which is mostly done via links or attachments to weekly announcements, not through alteration of the LMS shell. Face-to-face and hybrid courses at Park also utilize the online course shell, though instructors have permissions to alter the content to varying degrees based on departmental policy to make adjustments for the degree of face-to-face seat time in their courses.

When ParkWrites, the University's WAC program, was launched, it was done within a deeply entrenched enterprise model. Accelerated versions of the program's first-year writing courses and junior-level disciplinary writing courses had long before been developed for delivery online and at the satellite campuses. Sections of these courses were being taught across the country and online, largely staffed by a cadre of approximately 100 adjunct faculty.

With the structure for online writing instruction firmly in place, faculty learning and support became the most significant consideration regarding the scalability of the WAC program. While the WAC program had offered a very successful in-person week-long summer workshop the first five years, it largely drew full-time faculty, as the majority of full-time faculty live in the vicinity of the main campus, while the majority of adjunct faculty do not. Early in the development of our WAC program, a focus on full-time faculty was somewhat intentional as we needed faculty with institutional power to help enact WAC-related policies and curricular changes. However, the workshop did include several adjuncts each year, and in good budget years, we flew out one or two adjunct instructors from a distance. Beyond the budgetary limitations of including faculty at a distance, one of the other complications of the summer workshop for adjunct faculty is that the workshop also focuses on larger curricular building strategies that adjunct faculty have little agency to enact within the enterprise model.

However, as the University moved towards adoption of a writing intensive curricular model to round out the WAC program, it became clear that faculty training in WAC/WID best practices in teaching writing needed to be accessible to, and perhaps required of, the entire teaching community at Park, which led to several challenges we needed to address to design such training.

Unique Challenges of Designing and Implementing WAC Training Online

Park's somewhat unique institutional structure presents a number of challenges for developing a WAC program in general, and a university-wide WAC training initiative in particular. As we designed our training course, we kept these complications in mind.

Reconciling WAC Values with the Enterprise Model

Perhaps the most difficult challenge in designing our training was working within an enterprise model of online course design. Centralized course design is seen as one way to ensure consistency, enable assessment, and support instructional quality when oversight of hundreds of adjunct instructors becomes increasingly difficult with fewer full-time faculty, who themselves are often overloaded with teaching and other service responsibilities. While we would not argue that such institutional arrangements are desirable or ideal, they are the reality for many institutions like ours that need to provide a consistent, high-quality education on declining budgets and endowments (a pressure, we might add, that has only intensified in the current COVID-19 climate).[2]

The enterprise model presents challenges for institutions wishing to develop WAC training for faculty, as we discovered while designing our new training course. The first important challenge we had to consider was that WAC theory predominantly assumes faculty have agency to develop or change their own courses. Additionally, the WAC faculty workshop (as represented in WAC literature) takes for granted faculty who are physically present to train and build relationships with their colleagues across the disciplines. For WAC directors trained in best practices, the enterprise model can conflict with our professional norms. For example, the 2013 Conference on College Composition and Communication position statement on online writing instruction insists on teacher control of online courses, equitable pay, access to professional development, and teacher satisfaction, all of which the enterprise model seems to undermine. However, many WPAs may find themselves, as we have, working in institutions where they may feel their professional norms are in conflict with the dominant institutional arrangements, and we would like to suggest that there are ways to work within (and perhaps somewhat against) the grain that can benefit both instructors and students, while still honoring our values as WAC and writing studies scholars.

Geographically Dispersed Faculty

The majority of Park's courses are staffed by adjunct faculty, most of whom are not within driving distance of Park's flagship campus. The challenge of working with instructors all around the country, across multiple time zones (and even in a few cases, instructors in different countries), makes training through asynchronous online means difficult but also very necessary. Most of our instructors never meet their colleagues in person, and the extent to which adjunct instructors feel/are included in departmental meetings or activities varies widely across the university. Faculty working in enterprise model online courses can feel disempowered and isolated, lacking both agency in their own classrooms and relationships with the online course developers and full-time faculty who make all the decisions about curriculum and course design. Compounding the marginal position some adjunct faculty occupy—remote adjunct faculty, in particular—is the reality that the majority of contingent faculty teach for multiple institutions, juggling time commitments and grappling with difficult decisions about where to invest extra professional energy (American Association of University Professors, 2017).

Varying Levels of Pedagogical Preparation and Interest in Pedagogy

While it is likely universally true that faculty across disciplines receive varying levels of pedagogical training prior to becoming teachers, Park's extensive professional program offerings perhaps widens this gap somewhat, as adjuncts in some areas may be hired more for their professional experience than for their pedagogical credentials. This reality can present some challenges that are not easily overcome, as we will discuss later, but most importantly, it means that some faculty come to a WAC workshop with little to no exposure to pedagogical research, and may have received no pedagogical training or teaching experience in their professional graduate degree programs. What is even more challenging is that faculty teaching in some professional programs are expected to teach the "academic" discourses of their fields, though they themselves are not necessarily immersed in those academic discourses (in other words, they do not do

research in their field or publish academically but still must teach students how to write researched projects in academic genres associated with their disciplines).

On the other hand, a terrible job market in other disciplines, and the overproduction of PhDs, means that some of Park's adjunct faculty are exceptionally well-trained in pedagogy and have many years of teaching experience gained through graduate programs and in long careers teaching for multiple institutions; some have even attended WAC workshops and initiatives at other universities. It is difficult to design an experience that can appeal to faculty with such a wide range of interest and experience in teaching.

Mix of Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty

Park is not alone among peer institutions in its reliance upon adjunct faculty. In any given academic year, the University employs approximately 115 full-time faculty, as compared to approximately 850 adjunct faculty. This mix of full-time and adjunct faculty in our WAC on-ground training was, at varying times, a benefit and a challenge. Certainly benefit accrued from the dialogue facilitated by the workshop; however, adjunct faculty participants' status was visible and felt in the face-to-face format. The University's small full-time faculty community is tight-knit, with entrenched institutional memory and shared experience. This dynamic can be difficult to navigate for many adjunct faculty.

No Financial Incentive for Course Takers

Our in-person summer workshop has a small budget, which provides a stipend for ten faculty to engage in a more intensive experience (with additional requirements after the course ends), but the budget could not stretch to accommodate the hundreds and hundreds of instructors who would need training to roll out a WI program. The alternatives (to scrap the program altogether or to maintain the program with no effective training) also seemed, to us, untenable. While not ideal, we have encouraged programs to find non-monetary incentives to encourage instructors to sign up, and we lowered course caps in WI courses as well, which may act as its own inducement for getting certified to teach courses. In many departments, the proposed WI course is a senior-level capstone, which also provides some incentive for WI instructors who wish to build their teaching record to include upper-level courses. We also issue digital badges for completion through the university teaching and learning center; these credentials can be used in yearly faculty evaluations as evidence of professional development. Several of our course takers have used these badges as evidence of professional development at other institutions where they teach, either other universities or in two cases, the public schools where teachers have more requirements for professional development.

In designing the online course, we strived for not only sufficient quality but also inarguable usability, so that instructors who are spending their time to complete the course feel they get value from the experience. As a result, our priority was to design the course in such a way that it focuses on aspects of WAC pedagogy we felt would be the most valuable or useful to instructors, the most likely to be usable by all faculty, regardless of their employment status (part-time, adjunct, full-time, tenure-line, etc.), and that limited how much we expected from them each week. Getting maximum value for minimum time is a tall order.

The Design of Park's Four-Week Online WAC Faculty Course

The four-week training course is delivered asynchronously through the LMS, and we (the authors) take turns facilitating the course.[3] While we found few examples of fully online WAC training when we started developing this project, the ones we did stumble across worked mostly through a self-guided tutorial model rather than as a full course in which participants could interact with a facilitator with expertise in WAC who could answer questions, share additional resources, and give feedback on assignments. The presence of a course instructor is certainly one of the most essential aspects of the training course. Instructors are

experienced writing teachers with formal training in rhetoric and composition and writing across the curriculum theory and practice. In addition to the important feedback given on assignments, facilitators are responsible for redirecting any misconceptions about teaching writing by grounding discussions in the research literature.

The technical design and delivery of our four-week online course was adapted from standard approaches to training faculty in WAC and built upon foundational concepts that inform WAC training and the teaching of writing, such as those codified by the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* (2011) developed by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and the National Writing Project (NWP), including understanding writing as rhetorical and writing conventions as epistemological; the importance of understanding and teaching writing as a process; and developing critical thinking through writing.

Participants complete one unit per week, which consists of a unit overview, a lecture, a discussion board, an assignment, and additional materials and resources appropriate to the content of the unit. Participants must complete at least one discussion post each week, along with two response posts to fellow participants. At the end of each week, participants submit an assignment. Because the training is limited to 20 participants, the instructor is active on the discussion board each week and able to provide detailed feedback on assignments in a timely fashion.

The weekly assignments are not meant to be time-consuming or simply a hoop that participants must jump through to complete the course. Rather, the assignments are meant to be practical. For example, in Week 1, after learning about the effectiveness of writing-to-learn activities, participants must then design a writing-to-learn activity for their classroom. In Week 3, participants practice giving effective feedback on student writing after learning about best practices. The focus on pedagogical techniques provides participants across disciplines with a variety of take-aways that can be immediately integrated into their courses.

In addition to a course overview module, the course includes the following four modules (a complete syllabus appears in Appendix A):

> **Week 1: What is WAC, WI, and WID?** This first module is an introduction to writing across the curriculum, including some of its history and effectiveness, and the writing intensive curriculum at Park. Unit 1 also details how to design and use writing-to-learn activities.
>
> **Week 2: Disciplinary Writing Conventions.** This unit gives participants the tools and language to articulate and teach discipline-specific conventions in their fields, which can help faculty make their expectations for writing more explicit for their students.
>
> **Week 3: Feedback, Revision, and Grammar.** Unit 3 explores effective techniques for responding to student writing, addressing grammar and mechanics, and handling the paper load. It also encourages using revision as part of the writing process in courses of any discipline.
>
> **Week 4: Choose your own adventure.** The final week of the course allows participants to take a deeper dive into the topics they believe have the most relevance to their teaching, such as effective peer review, student citation practices, and developing writing assignments. The structure of the course allows these options to be expanded and for additional options to be added in future iterations of the course. New course modules and resources can be added at any time based on demand, and participants remain enrolled in the course and can access new material as it is added.

However, Park's four-week training also strives to achieve a number of distinctive goals. When designing the online course, we considered the standards for the traditional face-to-face format. What makes these traditionally-formatted workshops so effective? And which of these elements can be translated to the online space? In pursuing those questions, we remained grounded in our practical experience as online teachers, specifically the importance of seeking transformation—not replication—when designing learning

experiences online. In other words, we did not embark on the design of the online course with the desire to replicate the face-to-face workshop; rather, we started with the major learning outcomes and goals in mind and then attempted to leverage the unique benefits of the online, asynchronous context.

Goals of the Course

Ensuring Accessibility

As mentioned earlier in this article, one of the major drawbacks of the face-to-face faculty workshop is that it excludes faculty members who do not live near our flagship campus and cannot afford the travel expenses to get to campus. Park's 40 campus centers are scattered across the United States, which means the majority of our faculty cannot attend the face-to-face workshop. The online format allows faculty from anywhere to participate.

Additionally, the face-to-face workshop is a week-long commitment, a commitment that is implausible for many faculty members. The four-week asynchronous model allows participants to work through the material at their own pace and participate when it suits their schedules.

Last, the face-to-face workshop at Park only supports 10 participants a year, and because of geographic distance and the prohibitive expense of flying in participants, most instructors employed by Park are excluded from the opportunity to participate. In contrast, the online model provides 20 seats per four-week session. During the last academic year, we ran five sessions at capacity, which resulted in 69 faculty members trained in WAC. Ninety-three percent were adjunct faculty. In AY 2020-21, we are scaling up our capacity to accommodate 120 participants in a single year.

Engaging Faculty as Writers

In her 2001 essay "The Pedagogy of Writing Across the Curriculum," McLeod states that faculty workshops "must model the pedagogy they are promulgating" (p. 62). Specifically, McLeod discusses writing-to-learn and writing-to-communicate as pedagogical techniques that should be modeled in the faculty workshop. This has been one of the easier elements to incorporate into the online course at Park. The discussion board, a staple of most asynchronous online courses, is a natural space for participants to reflect on the concepts through writing and then to further use writing to communicate to other participants. The online format arguably transformed the workshop into more of a class format: in the face-to-face workshop, the bulk of the preparation falls to the facilitator and while participants talk about writing, they do not necessarily themselves write. In contrast, the online format puts the onus on the participants to prepare for meaningful interaction in the discussions. Weekly assignments, which are submitted and reviewed via a set of feedback criteria, receive personalized feedback, creating a relationship between the facilitator and participants unique from what is possible in the traditional face-to-face design.

Creating Community across Disciplines and Faculty Ranks

McLeod (2001) further emphasizes an ideal pedagogical approach for WAC workshops through "two rules of thumb: faculty should themselves write, and faculty should have opportunities to talk to each other about writing" (63). As mentioned above, the online space is a natural fit for getting participants to write about the concepts introduced in the faculty workshop. However, we found the second rule of thumb to be a bit more abstract in the online space.

Like any WAC workshop, a major goal is to connect faculty across disciplines. One of the great advantages of the online model is that faculty who are not only across disciplines but also across geographical locations can connect. Like the face-to-face workshop, we are able to vary the make-up of each session with faculty from a variety of disciplines and locations; unlike in our face-to-face workshop, we are able to ensure a

diverse blend of full-time and adjunct faculty. The online setting has proven to have an inclusive and democratizing effect in terms of the interactions among full-time and adjunct faculty, especially since one's employment status is not marked in a visible way in the LMS environment (people may reveal they are full or part time in discussion, but there is no automatically visible marker of status). In the face-to-face summer workshop, full-time faculty tend to gravitate towards close colleagues who routinely interact with one another. It is also not uncommon for full-time faculty to apply to the summer workshop in the same year as close colleagues, which can create the appearance of cliquey groups that can be harder for the few distance adjunct faculty who attend each year to navigate socially. The conversation then tends to revolve more around the concerns, teaching privileges, and deep institutional knowledge of full-time faculty, which results in a kind of unintentional exclusion of the few adjunct instructors who attend the summer workshop each year. In the online environment, however, this clumping and foregrounding of full-time faculty concerns simply cannot occur. In any one section of the online course, only one or two full-time faculty may participate, which also means that the perspective and needs of adjunct faculty are well represented, and that the full-time faculty (which includes us as facilitators) get more exposure to the teaching experiences of a majority of our faculty.

According to Fulwiler (1981) in his essay "Showing, Not Telling, at a Writing Workshop," the ideal faculty workshop is in the form of a retreat. He describes "[a] place where teachers are on neutral ground, removed from mailboxes, telephones, students, classes, secretaries, and families." He explains that "[i]n this setting writing can be explored slowly, thoroughly, and experientially among colleagues who are interested because they are mutually concerned with the quality of student writing" (p. 109). While making an online workshop feel like a retreat may be a little ambitious, the online format for the faculty workshop does achieve the element of putting participants on equal footing. In fact, the online space is inherently an equalizer. It provides accessibility in ways that face-to-face spaces cannot.

Likewise, from our own personal experiences, we agree that, when the effects of prior relationships or employment status are mitigated by the facilitator to create an inclusive environment, one of the most beneficial elements of the face-to-face faculty workshop is the camaraderie that forms among faculty members and the relationships that are strengthened between faculty members from different disciplines. In the face-to-face workshop, participants are engaging with the material at the same time, they are seated near each other, and are constantly in conversation with one another. While the online discussion board serves to engage faculty in conversation, it does not compare to the face-to-face experience of connecting with others. While often organic in the face-to-face setting, we have found that shared meaning making and collaborative knowledge construction has to be more intentionally scaffolded in the online discussion space.

Developing Instructor Agency in the Enterprise Model

A key goal in taking the WAC workshop experience online was to reach more adjunct faculty and to equip those faculty with tools for exercising agency within what can be a frustratingly standardized environment. Not only do online workshop participants have a degree of control over which topics they explore within their weekly unit assignments, but the content and weekly discussions also engage participants in reflection about how they can incorporate writing across the curriculum principles in their courses, especially those that are not designated writing intensive. For instance, participants discuss how to create writing-to-learn activities and embed them within the discussion threads (which are typically more available for adjunct faculty to edit than other aspects of the course) and how to build a writing process context around prescribed high-stakes writing assignments.

Finally, when designing Park's four-week online workshop we carefully considered ways we could give faculty agency over their learning of WAC concepts and in their implementation of these concepts in their classrooms. Fulwiler (1981) explains that "telling teachers how to use writing in their classes is very close to telling them that you know a better way to teach their subjects" (p. 108). According to Fulwiler, as facilitators

of WAC, it is important not only to give faculty the tools to teach writing but also to allow them the freedom to decide how to use those tools in their classrooms (p. 108). To this end, Park's four-week online workshop provides participants with options rather than mandates. We provide abundant resources, assignment ideas, and WAC theories and allow participants to decide what suits their subjects and their teaching styles. As we noted earlier, the "Choose Your Own Adventure" module in the final unit gives participants the freedom to explore a WAC concept that they have a strong interest in.

Providing Ongoing WAC Resources for Faculty

The design of our online workshop gives participants continued access to the course once the workshop has ended. In this way, the LMS shell doubles as a classroom and an organized, easily accessible repository for additional WAC resources often requested by participants. The course also includes additional resources and many links to materials on the WAC Clearinghouse site to encourage instructors to engage with the WAC community at large and to know where to find more resources specific to their needs or disciplines. Course facilitators share additional resources on specific topics as they come up in weekly discussion. In fact, one of the most useful aspects of the course from a program-planning perspective is the constant flow of information on desired topics and resources for ongoing WAC workshops and professional development opportunities, which allows us to react very quickly to needs when planning yearly activities.

The course includes activities that drive faculty to our own in-house resources, for example the many pedagogical resources produced by our teaching and learning center and ParkWrites workshops that are digitized and made available on-demand. Indeed, WAC programs and centers for teaching and learning often work together organically to create professional development, so this connection is both important and fairly typical for a WAC program and has been particularly generative for us in creating and promoting our resources. The course's announcements feature, combined with participants' continued enrollment in the course shell, gives us an avenue for publicizing ParkWrites events and activities, which we hope drives more participation in other aspects of our WAC programming. Furthermore, the online shell makes sharing of resources easier by facilitators AND participants. Posting links in discussion boards and announcements is easy and since most faculty are already familiar with the LMS environment, faculty add resources they find even without prompting.

Finally, we created a space where faculty can come together to discuss writing and share resources through a Facebook discussion group by inviting participants to join a community of Park faculty who are sharing resources and talking about the teaching of writing. This invitation to the group is posted in the fourth week of the training course.

Training Faculty in WAC Best Practices

This final goal is in line with any WAC faculty training workshop and that is to give participants basic training in the most important best practices of WAC. This is accomplished through the initial course experience and participants' ongoing exposure to the LMS shell. Participants' continued access to the course shell once the workshop has ended is key to keeping our faculty informed about new developments in WAC and keeping them motivated to develop their writing intensive courses using best practices.

Outcomes Data

Successes

Having now taught the course five times between May 2019 and May 2020, we have accumulated data that allow us to assess our course. In addition to the evidence provided by participants' engagement with discussion boards and assignments and three facilitators' experiences teaching the course, we also

implemented an anonymous survey at the end of each session to collect data that we use to assess our course and make plans for changes and additions. The survey (Appendix B) solicits both quantitative and qualitative feedback on the course, using a Likert scale for quantitative questions and free commenting in response to qualitative questions. Sixty-seven of 69 participants completed the survey.

To assess our data, we computed the average Likert score and answer frequency for the quantitative questions. For free-answer qualitative questions, we coded all the responses for themes, then counted how many responses engaged with each of the themes we identified. Note that because participants could comment on multiple aspects of the course in one comment, the numbers do not add up to a percent or total number of participants.

While there are certainly issues we need to address, we are encouraged that the experience has been very positive for most participants. Overall, participants have responded positively to the course as evidenced by not only the survey data but also our own observations of the participants' engagement with the course materials. This positive response is especially significant given the fact that participants were not paid for their time, and it suggests that we have successfully built a learning environment that is valuable and immediately useful to instructors.

- 97% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed the course was effective (4.6 on a 5 pt Likert)
- 100% agreed or strongly agreed the facilitator was effective (4.8/5)
- 79% indicated interest in future WAC professional development, 15% saying they may be interested in future learning opportunities. Only three participants indicated they were not interested in future professional development.

The data on continuing participation are of particular interest to us, as one important function of the course is to encourage instructors to be involved with other ParkWrites initiatives, especially one-off pedagogy workshops and events offered throughout the year. The LMS shell and the ParkWrites Facebook group that are advertised in the shell both become routes of reaching faculty to advertise our events. One interesting side-effect of the course so far appears to be some increased attendance by distance faculty at some of our spring workshops on digital technology and writing, which were offered both in-person and via web conference.

The qualitative data also confirm the general sense that the course is useful. When asked what was most effective in the course, and what should be kept when we revise the course, the most frequent response was that everything was good, relevant, or should be kept (28 responses). When asked what was ineffective, and what should be changed or dropped, 26 responses indicated that nothing needed to be changed or dropped. This was by far the most common answer to this question, and one of the very few statistically significant themes that emerged from this question.

When we analyzed what faculty thought was effective, we found that a significant number of qualitative responses (15 responses) mentioned the effectiveness of the material on giving good feedback to students, noting that getting comments from a facilitator on a commented student paper was especially helpful. Given our belief that having an active facilitator, versus a self-paced format, is important, it is especially gratifying to know that the most valued thing in the course was facilitator feedback. We think it is also significant that faculty largely identified the most effective element as the fact that all faculty can engage in the course, regardless of employment status. This result was particularly striking in that it is a big departure from assessment data from our in-person summer workshop, in which faculty typically identify writing-to-learn activities as the most significant takeaway.

We also found common responses that indicated we were fulfilling some of our other goals for the course. On the topic of cross-disciplinary exposure and community, we found that

- 8 responses mentioned that discussions were effective because getting different perspectives from instructors outside their own disciplines was eye-opening.
- 5 responses indicated that the Week 2 assignment (analyzing disciplinary discourse in a discipline different from one's own) was especially helpful in articulating disciplinary differences in writing. An additional three responses praised the disciplinary conventions discussion in the same unit.

Taken together, these themes show that one of the more dominant responses to the course (16 responses) was the value of being exposed to other disciplines. As an example, the following post by an English instructor in response to an instructor of political science was taken from a discussion board conversation, "I was fortunate in that, being an English major, I knew exactly how important writing was to me and how it could benefit me in my chosen profession. I'm not sure how to relate to students who don't understand why writing is critically important, so this report was valuable to me."

Other evidence showing how the course affected teaching practices was in the form of comments on discussion boards about how teachers and course developers were planning to change their teaching going forward, or had already changed their teaching while they were taking the course. For example, one participant shared this in the final week of the course: "I did learn many things that I can use to help students improve their writing. I have already started to apply them. Oddly enough, the students in my current class seem to be doing better at writing than any of my past classes." Many participants expressed sentiments similar to this instructor who especially appreciated the information on how to give good feedback to encourage revision: "I have spent years providing feedback to students at various levels, yet struggled with how to encourage students to revise and edit. I leave the course with a better understanding and excitement for improving the resources and assignments in the courses [and] advanced tools for presenting feedback that encourages revision rather than identifies errors."

Similarly, these participants, who also serve as online course developers, found value in the direct applicability of the course to their curriculum development:

> As a course developer: I will ensure that the courses I develop contain:
> - Written guidelines detailing precise expectations for writing assignments
> - Well-developed grading rubrics describing what students need to include in their writing assignments.
> - Examples of successful writing assignments, when needed
> - Other, applicable pedagogical suggestions provided in our course

Another course developer commented

> Based upon many of low stakes WAC activities that we have learned in this course, I am particularly interested in redesigning the discussion assignments in our WAC courses to focus on using several of these alternative types of prompts. I am also interested in redesigning discussions assignments to utilize different approaches, rather than the standard "one prompt, one board" that most [online] classes utilize.

In terms of our goal of increasing instructor agency, we seem to have had a positive response to the elements of the course that encouraged choice. Eleven responses on the anonymous survey mentioned the effectiveness of the choose-your-own-adventure assignments, six of whom liked having a choice of topics, five of whom especially liked the module on effective student peer-review, and one who liked being exposed to more resources and workshops being led by ParkWrites and the teaching and learning center. This finding suggests that our goal of letting instructors have more agency and choice is doing what we hoped it would do. It is worth noting that we try to model best practices in our own course, so we also hope that by

modeling choice and agency as course design options, it may also help some of our course designers to think differently about how to structure assignments.

One other development concerning instructional agency is harder to measure, which is whether the course is also driving institutional change around the enterprise course development system. While our program is still relatively new and we would need to collect more and different kinds of data to see how our program is affecting larger institutional structures, we do have some evidence that there are some shifts in thinking about restrictive elements of enterprise course management. For example, ParkWrites annually reports outcomes to the Provost's Office and our reports have had some impact on the course design process, most notably in widening the range of acceptable grading practices used to address writing assignments in the online environment. We have recently seen a shift in the review criteria used to assess online developments to include an incentive for online course developers who create banks of discussion and assignment prompts into their courses from which the adjunct faculty teaching the course can choose.

The data reported from the ParkWrites program in general and our four-week training course in particular have also become part of a larger conversation across the university about adjunct instructors, and our data are confirmed by other institutional sources of information, such as our peer review of teaching program, which reported similar findings related to adjunct instructors' desire for more agency in their classrooms and more connection to their departments and colleagues across the country. While the fruits of these aspects of our work have yet to fully mature, we can see some institutional movement towards a more fulfilling teaching experience for our adjunct faculty.

Opportunities for Improvement

While outcomes data seem to indicate a positive outcome of our course, there remain opportunities to continue improving the course. One such opportunity is how to address discrepancies we see as facilitators between participants' positive assessment of the course and our assessment of their performance on assignments. Take, for example, the second unit of the class, which engages participants in reflecting on discursive conventions and what those conventions reveal about the values of the discipline. At the end of the unit, participants analyze discourse in their own fields vis-a-vis a close reading of an academic article from outside their fields. Although the content and exercise is well aligned with the course outcomes and the participants generally do well in the scaffolding discussions about discourse conventions, participants' written analyses often evidence only surface engagement with academic writing in their disciplines or an over-reliance on notions of a generic or monolithic "academic writing." For example, one participant compared the disciplines of psychology and composition and noted that both "value a formal writing style and the use of citations" and that the psychology article uses "technical language and the overall tone of the article is one that is technical compared to [composition]." While the participant is not wrong about her observations, there is no discussion of the nuances of each discipline or any deep thinking about why each discipline uses citations in a particular way or what defines a "formal" writing style, for example.

Another participant's comment also reflects an arguably rigid view of academic writing we see frequently in comments on the discussion boards. In her assignment submission, she wrote:

> Writing a college paper is more flexible than math, but there are definitely formulas for organizing and developing a paper...If I were going to write a paper for [criminal justice], I would still need to include a thesis statement, an introductory paragraph, topic sentences, and a conclusion in the paper, even for first-or-second year students. The supporting information and documentation within those paragraphs may, and should differ, but the basic formula remains the same for organization… Each of these methods should and must be used by writers of any discipline…

Several things struck us about this participants' analysis of the similarity of writing across disciplines. First, it is interesting that she assumes there is such a thing as a singular "college" paper, which is fairly reminiscent of Melzer's (2014) observation that "formulaic, rigid versions of 'the research paper,' 'the essay,' and 'the paragraph'" are surprisingly persistent among assignments and professors nationally (p. 57).

We also observed the dominance of five-paragraph essay language in describing organizational methods, along with the assumption that this model is carried across all disciplines (and despite the fact that the course itself offers several examples of how writing in different fields uses different methods of organization to suit the knowledge-making purposes of the discipline). While articles in criminal justice do appear to have a set of common organizational moves, these moves are not necessarily the rigid and oversimplified organizational choices described by the participant. While other scholars have rightly observed there are some very generally shared conventions in academic writing (e.g., Thonney, 2011; Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006), and there certainly are well-loved writing textbooks that help demystify "formulas" used frequently in academic writing (e.g., Graff & Birkentein's *They Say, I Say* or Rosenwasser & Stephen's *Writing Analytically)*, the five paragraph essay is not one of those formulas.

It is worth noting that rigid and oversimplified notions about writing persist across many disciplines, even among some instructors who we might expect to "know better." For example, one of us had an uncomfortable exchange on the discussion board with an adjunct instructor in English who claimed rhetoric and composition as a disciplinary specialty, but who also firmly believed that no academic disciplines ever used first-person address (and would not be moved away from that assumption, even when presented with examples of notable texts in the discipline that very prominently use first person).

Given our institutional context, which is not high research, and our majority contingent faculty population, we wonder if the challenges with this assignment suggest that participants are not routinely immersed in the academic discourses or the production of academic texts in their disciplines. In revising the course, we need to further examine how to accomplish the goals of this unit—to provide participants with a more nuanced and rhetorical-based view of academic writing that will equip them to more meaningfully respond to students—without relying on assumptions about the writing life of our participants.

However, we might also note that this could be indicative of programmatic and curricular design issues in that developers do not necessarily create assignments that ask students to communicate via specific disciplinary or professional genres or to varying disciplinary or professional audiences. While we would need to gather stronger data on assignment design at the university to say this conclusively, it would certainly be in keeping with other research, such as Melzer's 2014 multi-institutional study of writing assignments, which showed the prevalence of a disappointingly narrow notion of writing that "neglect[s] to provide students with the kind of meaningful rhetorical purposes and social contexts found in assignments aimed at wider audiences, and often neglect[s] to give students practice in academic and professional genres of their discipline" (p. 34).

The unit on feedback was both the most enriching to some participants and also the most challenging. The culminating assignment asks participants to take a previously graded paper and revise the marginal and end comments as though they were commenting on an early draft. Across all sections of the course, we have found a pattern of participants persisting in marking grammar or only responding to low order concerns even when explicitly instructed not to—or the more important issue of not quite having the experience or training to really recognize deeper or connected writing issues that affect more superficial features. Not always knowing how to help a student revise or how to be explicit in giving feedback is a common problem (telling students to work on "flow" for example, which is meaningless to a student trying to revise). One participant's reflection potentially sheds light on participants' struggles with the feedback unit:

> I believe this is the challenge many, if not most, instructors face in trying to assist students in their writing: Instead of focusing on the process of writing, they are focused on the product.

> For one thing, it is easier and less time-consuming to focus on the product. That is not to say instructors are solely at fault in failing to focus on process. It may also be a product of larger institutional structures and traditions creating barriers to viewing student writing as a process.

Written by one of the adjunct faculty participants, this response is insightful on both pedagogical and, perhaps more tellingly, institutional levels. The reflection hints at the material realities facing many adjuncts who teach writing at multiple institutions, often simultaneously, in lieu of a full-time faculty position. The reflection also caused us to consider how the enterprise model in place at the university forms the "larger institutional structures and traditions" that may discourage faculty from seeing student writing and writing instruction in different ways.

A persistent theme in online learning is the challenge of facilitating meaningful asynchronous discussions. Our experience confirms the benefits and drawbacks of the asynchronous discussion thread as a centerpiece of each unit. In the face-to-face workshop, the discussions served as a vehicle for collaboratively refining a shared understanding of WAC principles, which often involved gentle and timely redirection or correction of reductive ideas about "good" writing (i.e., that good writing is grammatically pristine writing), plagiarism (i.e., that a primary role for instructors in WI courses is to police plagiarism), and feedback (i.e., that lower-order feedback is more important than higher-order to the development of writers). In other words, an important function of the discussions in the face-to-face workshops is to uncover, interrogate, and revise preconceived ideas about writing. This is delicate work for the facilitator and takes a keen sense of timing; indeed, it can be argued that such kairotic moments cannot occur in asynchronous discussions by their very nature. A redirect from a facilitator, in this context, risks appearing like a rebuke, or, perhaps worse, might be simply overlooked as one in a long chain of replies. Although written discussions often promote greater reflection, engage faculty in the act of writing, and have a tangible quality that can be satisfying to participants, discussion threads cannot capture the benefits of live interaction. As we revise the course, we want to experiment with alternatives to the post-and-reply-to-two-peers model used in the course, which, ironically, is patterned after the standard discussion thread set-up at the university.

A particularly noteworthy finding for us was participants' struggle to translate Writing to Learn (WTL) concepts and models into their own courses, which is one of the first assignments in the course. In the context of the face-to-face workshop, WTL represents a straightforward, evidence-based practice quickly embraced by participants. In contrast, in the online workshop, which asks participants to view several example WTL activities and adapt one for their courses, we noticed in the written responses that most participants simply repeated the model WTL and did not analyze how they would use the activity, or they proposed activities that did not align with the goals of WTL (i.e., they created high-stakes writing assignments that were formally assessed).

Again reflecting on the preponderance of adjunct faculty taking the online workshop, we believe this finding is an outcome of the institution's predominantly enterprise model of online course development. Informally, many adjunct course participants expressed skepticism that they would be allowed to supplement the departmentally mandated course content with WTL activities, even if these activities were inserted as non-credit bearing. For example, one of our participants commented:

> [O]ne concern or issue that I have with these tools however is for Instructors who do not create their own curriculum and simply Instruct courses that are pre-designed by a curriculum team. How can we go about incorporating these tools for our classrooms?

Interestingly, this is not wholly a matter of technical access (the configuration of the LMS allows faculty to add some content, albeit only in limited places) but speaks to the cultural influence of the enterprise model. On another discussion board, an adjunct faculty member described how she could incorporate mid-course surveys based on a presentation she watched in Unit 4 but qualified her ideas with, "Redesigning courses as

adjunct faculty may not be practical." In response, another adjunct participant wrote, "I was thinking the same thing, too, about how these strategies cannot be applied when it comes to adjuncts…I just follow through with everything that the course developer put together. Nothing is fluid or changeable, as far as I know." This issue surfaced again and again on the various discussion boards.

This struggle with the locked course shells and the culture around the enterprise model goes beyond simply adding and/or deleting assignments. Another participant reflected on the effect the limitations on adjunct faculty have on the effectiveness of their teaching:

> When teaching online courses that someone else has created—which is what I do for Park University—I sometimes struggle with how strongly to grade assignments. Sometimes I feel the directions and/or the grading rubric are not that clear, so it can take me a while to decide how many points to deduct, etc. I aim to revise directions, before the students read them, when I can to reduce confusion. However, as a course facilitator of someone else's course design I cannot edit the rubrics and many other items in a course...I also find it frustrating when I am teaching a course if the instructions or other material is [sic] unclear and I am trying to guess what the course designer intended by it. I have had times in the past when a student will reach out and ask, "What did you want for....." I would think, "Your guess is as good as mine." Of course, I would never say that to a student. If I am the instructor of the course and have no clue what the assignment is asking for, how can I expect the students to understand what it is asking for?

We are not willing to forego WTL content in the course; however, the above comments make it clear that the pre-populated, standardized online course content is creating a variety of issues for our adjunct faculty. We plan to make space to openly address the challenges involved in augmenting prescribed course content within the enterprise model. On both the level of the individual instructor's courses and leveraging the institutional capital of the full-time faculty taking the online course, we will work towards productive change in the way the enterprise model plays out among the university's programs.

One final thing we are working to improve as we move forward is creating better incentives and rewards for participating in the course. With COVID-19 deepening the budget crisis for most universities, budgetary issues have become increasingly pressing for institutions and instructors alike, yet those of us teaching the course feel very strongly about creating more value around the course for our instructors. Our first initiative was creating paid co-facilitator positions in the course to reward those adjuncts whose work as a participant in the course was particularly good and to create a stronger team of WAC advocates across ranks, disciplines, and locations. We also added ParkWrites professional development to our annual performance review forms so that instructors can be recognized for their hard work during their annual review. We have increased our use of existing systems of reward, such as our internal employee recognition program, which automatically notifies Human Resources and a direct supervisor and creates an additional artifact that can be used in annual evaluations. While these are small changes, we also are entering conversations with other programs and administrators at the university about how to increase compensation and recognition for our adjunct instructors, and the data we have gathered from the course is a useful tool for advocating for our instructors' needs.

Conclusion: WAC and the Growth of Online Learning

While our online WI certification course was developed and implemented long before the COVID-19 crisis moved most educational institutions into the realm of online teaching and learning, that crisis highlights how important developing online models for WAC training is in the digital age and the absolute necessity of creating universities that are more accessible to diverse students *and* faculty. While our 2020 summer workshop had to be cancelled due to the pandemic, our online training continued as scheduled, and,

surprisingly, a majority of participants scheduled for the March and May 2020 sessions stayed in the course and successfully completed the training. The WI course was accessible in a variety of ways that allowed it to run uninterrupted despite the pandemic.

The online and asynchronous nature of the course made our training in WAC more accessible to a wider variety of people in various places, ranks, and teaching situations. Many of our instructors may be prevented from taking an in-person, week-long workshop for very good reasons, including familial obligations, scheduling difficulties, or economic factors (such as needing to work a different job during the summer, thus preventing any week-long commitments). Being able to attend asynchronously over several weeks, and having some choices about when they could take such a course (since we offer it five times a year currently) gives participants a significant amount of control over how to manage the workload of the course around their other commitments and obligations.

COVID-19 is going to have many implications for higher education in general, and for WAC programs in particular, but programs that have been forward-thinking may negotiate changes in educational delivery models better than those that have not moved beyond the traditional faculty workshop. Beyond the current COVID-19 crisis, however, we think developing solid online faculty training in Writing Across the Curriculum could be influential in changing the culture around instruction and course design at Park and perhaps help us critique and transform the enterprise model into something that addresses the needs of the institution without sacrificing faculty creativity and autonomy.

More broadly, we hope that by sharing our motivations, challenges, and successes in developing a WAC program and accompanying online faculty training we can support other unique institutions like ours that do not fit the traditional institutional mold of higher education. We also hope to stimulate more conversation about what WAC programs can look like, which will ideally lead to a wider diversity of institutional representation in WAC research overall.

Appendix A: 4-week online writing intensive certification syllabus

Unit 1:

This unit introduces participants to writing across the curriculum, gives background on the major theories and approaches associated with WAC, acquaints participants with the new WI curriculum at Park, and helps participants develop their first writing intensive activity they can use in their own classes.

Watch: "Yo, That's WAC!" (video recorded by director that explains WAC origins, purposes, and theories)	Read: ● Johnson and Krase, "Coming to Learn: From First-Year Composition to Writing in the Disciplines" ● WI proposal to Faculty Senate (approved by senate in 2017)
Review: ● WTL activities handout ● WTL activities on WAC Clearinghouse ● Unit 1 resources (optional)	Write: ● Discussion: Response to Johnson and Krase's article ● Unit 1 Assignment: Design a WTL activity

Unit 2:

This unit gives participants tools and language for explicating the disciplinary and sub-disciplinary writing conventions in their field, which can help them make expectations for writing more explicit for students.

Watch: • Writing conventions and knowledge-making in the disciplines (video)	Read: • Teresa Thonney, "Teaching the Conventions of Academic Discourse"
Review: "What is Writing in the Disciplines?" at the WAC Clearinghouse	Write: • Discussion: disciplinary madlib (adapted from a handout from Linda Adler-Kassner at IWAC 2016) • Unit 2 Assignment: Compare disciplinary conventions from a field dissimilar to your own discipline

Unit 3:

This unit gives participants tools for giving effective feedback on student writing, handling the paper load, and some perspectives on grammar instruction to help students improve their writing.

Watch: • Giving Effective Feedback on Student Writing (video)	Read: • Pages 1-25 of Nancy Sommers, *Responding to Student Writers*
Review: • Tips for Handling the Paper Load • 10 Basic Writing Errors • Sample Error Log	Write: • Discussion: Reflection on a time participants got really good or really bad writing feedback • Unit 3 Assignment: Write a marginal and end comment on a student paper using the tips in the unit

Unit 4:

This unit helps participants explore ParkWrites and external resources most relevant to their classroom or teaching practices, request additional resources from ParkWrites, find out how to access future ParkWrites resources, give feedback on this writing intensive course, and suggest changes or improvements for future sessions.

Explore: ParkWrites professional development sessions (these are one-shot workshops archived on our intranet on topics such as using WTLs in quantitative disciplines, working with ELL student writing, using Turnitin to teach better citation, using digital storytelling tools, etc.)	Read/Watch: Choose 1 of these adventures to complete for your assignment: • Choose Your Own Adventure 1: Effective Peer Review • Choose Your Own Adventure 2: Exploring The Citation Project, Plagiarism and Student Source Use • Choose Your Own Adventure 3: Designing Effective Assignments

Write: • Discussion: Reflection on 1 professional development session • Unit 4 Assignment: Reflection on choose your own topic materials	Respond: Writing Intensive Course Survey

Appendix B: Anonymous Course Evaluation Survey

1. Overall, the writing intensive training course was effective.
   Strongly agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree
2. Overall, I found the facilitator effective.
   Strongly agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree
3. When we revise this training course for the next session, what should we keep and why? What were the most effective assignments, materials, and activities for you?
4. When we revise this training course for the next session, what should we drop, change, or add, and why? What was least effective for you and why?
5. Are you interested in future professional development activities or resources in writing across the curriculum?
   Yes
   No
   Maybe
6. If you answered yes or maybe, what professional development opportunities or resources related to WAC would you like to see ParkWrites develop?
7. What other comments would you like to share about your experience in this course?

References

American Association of University Professors. Background facts on contingent faculty positions (2017). *American Association of University Professors (AAUP).* https://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts

Breuch, Lee-Ann Kastman. (2015). Faculty Preparation for Online Writing Instruction. In Beth Hewett & Kevin Romberger-DePew (Eds.), *Foundational Practices for Online Writing Instruction* (pp. 355-393). Parlor Press and WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/owi/chapter11.pdf

Conference on College Composition and Communication. A position statement of principles and example effective practices for online writing instruction (OWI). (2013). *Conference on College Composition and Communication.* https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples

Framework for success in postsecondary writing. (2011). *Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and the National Writing Project (NWP).* https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED516360.pdf

Cox, Michelle, Galin, Jeffrey R., & Melzer, Dan. (2018). *Sustainable WAC: A whole systems approach to launching and developing writing across the curriculum programs*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Fulwiler, Toby. (1981). Showing, not telling, at a writing workshop. In Terry M. Zawacki & Paul M. Rogers (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: a critical sourcebook* (pp. 108-117). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Gardner, Clint. (2010). Introduction to writing across the curriculum at the community colleges: Beating the odds. [Special issues on Writing Across the Curriculum at the Community Colleges] *Across the Disciplines*, 7(2), 1-4. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/cc/gardner.pdf

Graff, Gerald, & Birkenstein, Cathy. (2021). "They say / I say": The moves that matter in academic writing (5th ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.

Kurzer, Kendon, Murphy, Greer, O'Meara, Katherine, & Russo, Robyn. (201). Sustainability from the Start: WAC-in-Progress at Diverse Institutions [Presentation]. Conference on College Composition and Communication, Pittsburgh, PA.

Magda, Andrew J., Poulin, Russell, & Clinefelter, David L. (2015). Recruiting, orienting, & supporting online adjunct faculty: A survey of practices. Louisville, KY: The Learning House, Inc. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED570518.pdf

Magnotto, Joyce N., & Stout, Barbara R. (2000). Faculty workshops. In Susan H. McLeod & Margot Soven (Eds.) Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs (pp. 23–34). WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/mcleod_soven/chapter3.pdf

Lowenthal, Patrick R., & White, John W. (2009). Enterprise model. In Patricia L. Rogers, Gary A. Berg, Judicth V. Rogers, Patricia L., Berg, Gary A., Boettecher, Judith V., Howard, Caroline, Justice, Lorraine, & Schenk, Karen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Distance Learning*, Second Edition (pp. 932-936). IGI Global. http://doi:10.4018/978-1-60566-198-8.ch130

McLeod, Susan H. (2007). *Writing program administration*. Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/referenceguides/mcleod-wpa/

McLeod, Susan H. (2001). The pedagogy of writing across the curriculum. In Terry M. Zawacki & Paul M. Rogers (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: a critical sourcebook* (pp. 53-68). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Melzer, Dan. (2014). *Assignments across the Curriculum: A National Study of College Writing* (1st ed.). Utah State University Press.

Online Learning Consortium. Report: One in Four Students Enrolled in Online Courses. (2016). *Online Learning Consortium (OLC)*. https://onlinelearningconsortium.org/news_item/report-one-four-students-enrolled-online-courses/#:%7E:text=The%20number%20of%20students%20taking,in%20least%20one%20online%20course

Rosenwasser, David & Stephen, Jill. (2019). *Writing analytically* (8th ed). Cengage.

Thaiss, Chris, & Porter, Tara. (2010). The state of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and results of the U.S. survey of the international WAC/WID mapping project. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(3), 534–570. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40593339

Thaiss, Chris, & Zugnoni, Michele. (2020). 2015-2020 national survey of US WAC/WID programs and initiatives. *International WAC/WID Mapping Project*. https://mappingproject.ucdavis.edu/content/2015-2020-survey

Thaiss, Chris, & Zawacki, Terry M. (2006). *Engaged writers and dynamic disciplines: Research on the academic writing life.* Boynton/Cook Heinemann Press.

Thonney, Teresa. (2011). Teaching the Conventions of Academic Discourse. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 38(4), 347–362.

Notes

[1] We have no known conflicts of interest to disclose.

[2] According to a 2015 study by Magda, Poulin, & Clinefelter, universities that offered online courses that utilized a master shell with little to no customization comprised roughly 23% of institutions. The same study found that an additional 25% only allowed some customization.

[3] In Spring 2021, we started experimenting with compensating co-facilitators drawn from excellent faculty participants in disciplines other than English, which has been quite successful so far, though these sections are outside the assessment data we present here.

Contact Information

Amy Mecklenburg-Faenger
Director of ParkWrites
Associate Professor of English
Park University
Email: amy.mecklenburgfaenger@park.edu

Brandi Handley
Assistant Director of ParkWrites
Lecturer of English
Park University
Email: bhandley@park.edu

Emily Donnelli-Sallee
Associate Provost
Professor of English
Park University
Email: emily.sallee@park.edu

Complete APA Citation

Mecklenburg-Faenger, Amy, Handley, Brandi, & Donnelli-Sallee, Emily. (2022, February 18). Making WAC accessible: Reimagining the WAC faculty workshop as an online asynchronous course. *Across the Disciplines*, 18(3/4), 244-264. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2022.18.3-4.03