CHAPTER 10.

LEADING FACULTY WRITING ACADEMIES: A CASE STUDY OF WRITERLY IDENTITY

J. Michael Rifenburg and Rebecca Johnston

University of North Georgia

Abstract. *This chapter examines faculty facilitators of writing academies, focusing on their role in fostering supportive environments that counter neoliberal imperatives in academia. Through interviews, the chapter highlights how collaborative writing groups foster community and resilience, offering a reprieve from academia's often competitive climate.*

In the Netflix show *Song Exploder*, rock band R.E.M. breaks down their 1991 Grammy-winning single "Losing My Religion." *Song Exploder*, based on the popular podcast of the same name, invites musicians to detail how they created their hit song. During this episode, the host interviews R.E.M.'s lead vocalist, Michael Stipe. The host asks for Stipe's permission to play aloud Stipe's isolated vocal performance from their hit song. Stipe cautiously agrees.

R.E.M., like most bands, records songs in pieces; each instrument and vocal performance is recorded separately and then mixed at the end. When the *Song Exploder* host plays Stipe's isolated vocals, Stipe uncomfortably listens. He sticks his tongue out and moans *ugh*. He closes his eyes, wrinkles jutting across his temples, his brow furrowed. He shakes his head back and forth, and, with his eyes still closed, turns his head up to the left. He looks pained as he listens to himself.

"It's still hard to hear," he remarks. "It's so naked, so raw; it's so unsupported."

Stipe cringes when he recognizes his "unsupported" singing because his singing was never intended to be unsupported. He recorded his vocals in anticipation of layering his vocals alongside the instruments his bandmates recorded. He recorded solo in anticipation and expectation of community.

Writing, like music, is communal. Scholarship on supporting faculty writers tells us again and again the importance of community for sustained and

productive scholarly careers. In this chapter, we highlight work we undertake to bring faculty writers into community. We specifically listen to the lead vocalists, to continue our musical metaphor, of these writing communities: faculty facilitators of scholarly writing groups.

We first locate ourselves, our work, and the Write Now Academy (WNA), an application-based faculty and staff semester-long academy designed to support faculty writers. We then present our methodology and methods and position ourselves within this ongoing exploratory case study. Next, we take readers into our data—stories gathered from three faculty facilitators of the WNA. We conclude by engaging more fully with the idea of faculty writing groups, like the WNA, as a tool for dismantling neoliberal imperatives such as speed and competition. To do this dismantling, we lean on Mulya's (2019) argument focused on how faculty developers can push against neoliberalism. We extend Mulya's argument to our context of working with faculty writers at a teaching-intensive university in the southeastern part of the U.S. Ultimately, we argue that leading faculty writing groups supports faculty amid pressures to push more, and counters speed and competition by creating a community of practice among all faculty participants.

OUR CONTEXT AND EXIGENCE

We work at the University of North Georgia (UNG), a multi-campus institution that arose through the consolidation of two campuses and the addition of three. For many faculty, consolidation brought increased scholarship expectations in revised promotion and tenure guidelines. But the common course load for faculty remained 4/4. An exigence for the Write Now Academy (WNA), then, was the challenge of supporting faculty scholarship at a teaching-intensive university where all faculty members were primarily undergraduate teaching faculty first.

Our positionality is central, in ways we recognize and ways we may never recognize, to how we developed, implemented, and reported this study. Michael, as a tenured, white, male associate professor whose disciplinary home is writing studies, seeks to design qualitative studies that provide research participants space to speak and have their narratives and life experiences represented through the study. Rebecca is a tenured professor who was an instructor of music education for many years but turned to work in faculty development in 2015. She currently serves as the Associate Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning and Leadership. In that role, she helps to design and provide faculty development opportunities to assist faculty in building and maintaining scholarly productivity. Both Rebecca and Michael have a vested interest in cultivating a community of scholar-teachers.

The WNA is a semester-long, application-based academy open to full-time faculty and teaching staff. Led by faculty members who have previously completed the academy, participants work through Belcher's (2009) *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks*, meeting together on Zoom four times during the Academy to share progress. Faculty facilitators make use of a shared Google doc where participants respond to prompts based on the Belcher book. Successful completion of the academy is contingent upon participants submitting an article for publication by the end of the following semester. The WNA is housed in UNG's Center for Teaching, Learning, and Leadership, a faculty development center designed to support teaching, research, and leadership through a variety of programming options.

Two bodies of research shaped this academy. First, the WNA draws on the community of practice model as articulated by Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002). The co-authors described communities of practice wherein participants "don't necessarily work together every day," but "share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis" (p. 2). In the Academy we share knowledge, set goals and deadlines, create a peer community, and foster a sense of self-efficacy.

Second, the WNA draws on research regarding how to support faculty writers; this research often arises from the foundational work of Boice (1985), an early advocate of faculty writers and writing. He and subsequent researchers (e.g., Eodice & Cramer, 2001; Tulley, 2018) provide faculty developers concrete steps for coaching faculty writers as they build sustained scholarly productivity. Most applicable to our work is scholarship specifically on how teaching and learning centers have an important role in supporting faculty writers (Gray, Madson, & Jackson, 2018). We particularly draw from Cox and Brunjes's (2013) research on building support for faculty writers at teaching-intensive schools.

OUR METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

As decolonial researchers and theorists like Smith (2012) and Tuck and Yang (2014) remind us, we undertake qualitative research through our privileged position as white tenured faculty members who share a vested interest in cultivating an active community of scholar-teachers; therefore, we proceed with caution and a stated commitment to building knowledge collaboratively with our participants that benefits not just us, as researchers, but also the participants. Our methodology and methods grow out of our local context, grow out of our work with our research participants, and grow out of the kind of knowledge we and our participants want to build and circulate.

We designed a single-bounded exploratory case study because of the nature of our in-progress research; this chapter is the result of a larger project that studied supporting faculty writers at our home institution. We bounded our study spatially (at UNG) and temporally (Spring, 2020). The question we investigated was: *how does leading a faculty writing academy shape one's writerly identity?* In undertaking an exploratory case study on the effects on a faculty writing retreat on faculty well-being and productivity, Brantmeier, Molloy, and Byrne (2017) wrote that such research designs allow for researchers to "parse important themes and clarify the direction of related future projects" (n.p.). We continue an ongoing investigation of the effectiveness of our academy for participants and faculty facilitators and peek into our early data in this chapter.

PARTICIPANTS

We invited all faculty facilitators to participate in this study through an IRB-approved email invitation. They did not receive compensation for participation. We used semi-structured interviews in which we pre-designed a list of questions that helped us investigate our research question: *how does leading a faculty writing academy shape one's writerly identity?* After receiving consent, we audio-recorded the conversations. All three participants read over our draft to ensure we captured their words and experiences accurately. We use pseudonyms.

We interviewed:

- Todd, a tenure-track assistant professor of communication
- Madison, a tenured professor of psychological sciences
- Phillips, a tenure-track assistant professor of English

STORIES AS ANALYSIS

We offer stories of faculty describing how serving as faculty facilitators for the WNA shapes their writerly identity. Our analysis, then, is one of story. In doing this work of story as analysis, we take guidance from Patel (2019) who, in "Turning Away from Logarithms to Return to Story," explained:

> In my own work, which is never my own but linked to many people, it has never been enough to ask an interview question, record it, code it, and report what I perceive to be the meaning underneath what is said. That sequence should smack of individualized hubris; it does to me. (p. 272)

Patel disagreed with the assumed value of objectivity and systematicity that stand as hallmarks of euro-centric academic research. Taking a story approach

to qualitative research, then, asks that we do more than detail the mechanics of research, what Patel terms "logarithms." We offer these mechanics: who we interviewed, how, for how long. But we emphasize story as analysis by adopting what Stornaiuolo, Smith, and Philips (2017) called an "inquiry stance" in which researchers account for their own role in "unfolding activity" and "routinely question their own assumptions and positionalities while remaining sensitive and open to multiple interpretations" (p. 76). We draw particular attention to how Stornaiuolo, Smith, and Philips used *question, sensitive,* and *open* because these terms help us remain invested in story as analysis. Instead of chopping the words of our interview participants into pithy quotes that are then tucked tidily into charts and columns, we provide lengthy interview quotes, try to represent the ebb and flow of conversation as participants think through responding aloud to challenging questions about their writerly identity, and allow for contradictions to arise within individual stories, because exploratory case studies do not offer firm findings but in-the-moment reflections of people struggling with the challenging process of speaking aloud about writerly identity.

Through these three stories—one story for each research participant—we toggle between summarizing their experience and quoting them directly.

STORIES OF FACULTY FACILITATING THE WRITE NOW ACADEMY

Todd

Todd serves in a tenure-track role in the School of Communication, Film, & Theatre at UNG. His most recent publication, taken from his dissertation, found a home in the *Journal of Transformative Learning*. Even with a recent publication and smoothly progressing toward tenure and promotion, Todd said he emphasizes his writing struggles when leading the WNA:

> I tried to be honest with my colleagues saying that "I'm
> trying to help you guys be better writers, but remember, this
> is where I'm coming from. I come to the table with my own
> hang-ups. I'm not like this someone who produces and writes,
> and I'm not a prolific writer, and, and so, you know, I'm a
> flawed writer." But I like to work with my colleagues.

Todd first went through the WNA as a participant before he shifted to leading his colleagues through this Academy. Michael led the WNA when Todd completed it. Todd began his story by reflecting on what he learned as a faculty participant and then shifting to why he elected to serve as a faculty facilitator:

> I think my participation, as a faculty member, you know, working with [Michael], I remember that first semester that we got to know each other, that it was just so meaningful, for me, you know, to work with my colleagues, and to kind of realize my strengths in terms of writing. I benefited so much from that, it was just such a meaningful experience for me that, when I had the chance to lead the group, it just resonated so strongly that I thought, "I want to continue that, and maybe others can kind of feel what I felt."

He described the community that is built through the WNA:

> It's a safe space, you know, where colleagues can kind of get together, where they can self-disclose some of their fears about some of their limitations, demands on their time, and how all those things kind of impact writing. And I think it provides that nice structure within the community that we can kind of work together to say, "Okay, well, yeah, we've got these challenges; we've got teaching, we've got advising, we've got all these other things, but, but we also have to kind of, you know, set aside some time for ourselves, and work towards enhancing our own scholarship." And, so I think in that it just provides that nice sense of structure and a way to kind of connect with each other. That's very supportive and encouraging. And I think that's building that sense of community kind of helps us. It's empowering. And, you know, it makes us feel like, "Yeah, I can do this."

When his story shifted to how leading an WNA shaped his writerly identity, he described dispositions formed through WNA that support sustained scholarly productivity:

> [Leading the Academy] kept reminding me the very things that I learned initially when was taking the [WNA], not leading it, but just taking it in, and I fall sometimes into my own bad habits when I'm out of that community. Then I have to kind of remind myself like, "Okay, yeah, I have a writing goal. So, let's go back to what we learned about the basics from the Write Now Academy that I have to set aside some time." I tried to be honest with the colleagues that I was leading, I kind of reminded them that in many ways I'm leading this but I'm also learning as well. And I may give you some advice,

but I'm also looking to you for advice and, and motivation
and structure to help me, because it's easy for me to fall into
bad habits.

He brought these lessons on structure and discipline to bear on a then-cur-
rent writing project:

I am in the process of doing some writing right now. I saw a
call from one journal, and they want the submission of essays
about lessons we learned teaching online during COVID.
And it just really resonated with me, right? So, I have been
very, trying to be very structured, even though I'm busy with
my teaching responsibilities and so forth. I try to set some
time, like each morning. It's almost like depositing some
money, like, before I pay all my other bills, I pay myself a
little bit. So, I need to put some in my savings. And so, I need
to work on me, and my goals first. I set aside maybe an hour
every day, and I do a little bit of writing up, do some research
thinking about my article that's due on August 31st. Then
I think, "Okay, now I got that taken care of. So no, I don't
have to feel, you know, stressed out or frustrated, because I'm
not doing what I need to do." And then I think, "Okay, I feel
some accomplishment. I've got some writing. Now, let me, let
me check my emails. Now, let me start working on class prep,
grading, and so forth. I've got the rest of the afternoon now to
work on that." But I've already got my writing out of the way.
I think that Write Now Academy helped me structure all that.

As he continued his story, Todd stressed the importance of helpful disposi-
tions as a key to his writerly identity and what he saw as integral to supporting
his writing:

I think [serving as a faculty facilitator] definitely enhanced my
own self efficacy as a writer. Prior to getting involved in the
Write Now Academy, I didn't really think about writing and
making that a part of my scholarship. Prior to my working
with the Write Now Academy, I felt like I wasted some time.
When I joined the Write Now Academy, it kind of set up,
that, yes, I can do this. I think it enhanced my writing be-
cause, out of that, I actually had an article that was published.
… That was so tremendously satisfying. I think the Academy
kind of contributed to my being able to do that. Having this

structure, having kind of being accountable to my colleagues that I needed to stay productive and, and generate things because I felt like I would lose face a little bit if I came to a meeting, and I said, "Well, you know, I didn't do anything." That wouldn't look very good for me, and so it kind of gave me accountability and motivation.

He concluded his story by pointing to concrete changes in his writing practice resultant of serving as a faculty facilitator:

In terms of just my way of practicing writing, prior to my involvement in the Write Now Academy, either as a participant or as a facilitator, I used to always think that I needed huge blocks of time, and I think that kind of contributed to my lack of productivity. I learned that small steps kind of result in big outcomes. So, it's sort of my involvement that taught me to set aside some time in the morning and, and even if I'm doing just a short amount of writing, if it's 15 minutes, if it's a half hour, by the end of the week, that's cumulative, I can look back and I can say, "Okay, well, look at what I've achieved." And that kind of motivates me. These small, little steps that result in big rewards. I think that came across in facilitating the group. If we take these small steps, if we just write for 15 minutes or so, by the end of the week, we've got something sizable. If you write a paragraph or so, by the end of the week you see some tangible results that motivates you. I don't know if it improved the way I wrote, but I think, if anything, it just gave me a structure in which to write and be more disciplined and to motivate myself to sit down and begin. I think that was the greatest thing that I took away from my time in the Write Now Academy. So maybe it's more of a process thing, like how to sit down and write.

Madison

Madison serves in a tenured position within the Department of Psychological Sciences where she researches the impact of prenatal exposure to known toxicants and how this impacts later development and processes of learning and memory. She most recently published in the journal *Neurotoxicology and Teratology*.

Like Todd, Madison told a similar story about why she elected to serve as a faculty facilitator of the WNA. She wanted to help her colleagues:

It's this type of service for the university that I actually really liked. Most of the stuff that I do, some of it is just like, 'Oh, you're on this committee, you do this thing.' But this seemed to be really impactful. And having gone to the Write Now Academy, I wanted to help those who are coming through it again, or going through it after me with the experiences that I had gained when I did it, and I just felt like I had a lot to contribute to it. And it was a way of fulfilling that goal, while also getting rewarded to the service aspect of it.

Madison, like Todd, articulated how leading a WNA has shaped her writing and how she thinks about herself as a writer:

Okay, so my writing has changed after being a part of the [WNA], especially regarding contacting the editors and knowing that process a little bit better. So, when I had to lead the [WNA], I felt a lot more that I had to lead by example, more so than when I did the [WNA]. To lead by example, I would actively do the skills that the book [*Writing Your Journal Article in Twelve Weeks*] was talking about … it made me more conscientious about my writing. [Leading the WNA] made me more understanding that the work I'm doing isn't just for publication; it's to help my fellow people with their struggle. My struggle with writing and my accomplishments in writing can help them. I felt more conscientious or more aware of my writing process because I had to lead them.

She continued by reflecting more on how she views herself as a writer:

I obviously struggle with writing; that's why I [participated in] the Write Now Academy. Sometimes it feels like, since I struggle with writing, I shouldn't be the one who's telling others how to go about writing … I would say that when it comes to writing, it's not always my favorite part. Writing itself can be a daunting task at times, right? And the fear of rejection from an editor is intimidating a lot of the times. But, when I'm in it, I dive into it. And one thing that I think really stuck with me, and I shared with the [WNA], is one of the tenets of research ethics is that when you have data to share that you should share. You need to publish because it's just something you're supposed to do. You need to be getting your knowledge out there for the world to know. When I feel less

than motivated, I realize it's something I need to be doing. It's an ethical thing.

Madison articulated benefits she has derived from leading the WNA and connects these benefit to a current writing project that finds her co-authoring with a colleague and writing in a genre in which she does not have experience:

> Leading the [WNA] allows me to better understand and see examples of different kinds of writing. We get so embedded in our specific form of writing within our department. So, you know, I do empirical studies, I write empirical reports; you know, purpose, methods, results, conclusions, that kind of thing. And literature reviews or meta-analyses or things like that are outside of my ballpark in a way. And so leading [WNA] allows me to have a better chance to have a true discussion with people about that kind of style of writing. That's benefited me now because I'm doing a collaborative research study with some colleagues in my department, and it's a review paper, which is very different than what I'm used to. But having gone through this kind of thing I've seen concrete examples of what this should look like. And we also talked about the process of writing that paper. So that helps me. That part has really helped me a lot with this specific collaborative study.

Madison concluded her story by reflecting on a writerly identity supportive of sustained scholarly productivity:

> Having to lead the [WNA], in a way, forces you to feel more confident with it. And you end up realizing how much you know that you didn't know you knew. And a little bit of that whole fake it 'til you make it kind of thing. Or it's like, "I'm not very confident in my writing, but I'm going to exude the confidence needed to run this academy." And then you feel more confident because of it. I think that that was probably the biggest benefit of how it helps me in my approach to writing. It's changing your whole dynamic of how you think about yourself as a researcher, and approach writing and feeling confident and your skills that you kind of underplay sometimes.

Phillips

Phillips, a tenure-track assistant professor in the Department of English, has published three single-authored books and is currently working on a fourth. In

his words, he researches "the interplay of science fiction, horror, and especially folk tales and folk beliefs." Even though his CV suggests that he is an experienced writer, he expressed surprise when Michael invited him to lead an Academy:

> Well, to be honest, it definitely took me by surprise. You know, my career trajectory has been really interesting. And I had a lot of publications before I was even on the tenure track. So, you know, I never thought about myself as being in a position to mentor other people on the publication process and taking their academic writing to publication. So, my initial reaction was surprise and it kind of made me reflect on some of the things that I had accomplished with all of their challenges, pitfalls, a lot of those especially early, and I guess I just thought, if I could help people just getting to navigate those, it would be a nice thing to do.

When our conversation turned to how leading the WNA shapes one's writerly identity, Phillips paused. He said,

> Interesting. It's gonna be hard to articulate. Let me think through that. This fourth book is the only one that I didn't write … which, as I reflect on it, I don't think writing a book from introduction to you know, chapter six, seven, conclusion, whatever, front to back is the best way to do it. But that's what I essentially did with books one through three. I might have waited for the introduction on book three, just a little bit. But [book four], I have written completely out of order. And so that part's easy to articulate. *Why* is more difficult. I think it has to do with, well, partly it had to do with the fact that I was really trying to find the core of the argument that I was trying to make. And I think it probably has to do with discussions [in the WNA] about really identifying the stakes of your argument. Maybe being, even though it was more difficult, but being better at recognizing what those are. But if there was anything that sort of changed me in terms of my practice, it might be that.

THEMES IN THE STORIES

We approach these excerpted stories through our research question: How does facilitating the WNA shape one's writerly identity? These stories emphasize how serving as faculty facilitators for the WNA helps Todd, Madison, and Phillips

with their own writing projects. In their stories, Phillips points to changes in his writing processes, while Madison and Todd reflect on dispositions that help with their current writing projects. Phillips is working on his fourth single-authored book. In his story, he describes how, for the first three books, he largely wrote linearly: introduction, chapters in order, and then the conclusion. With this book, however, he finds himself writing it "completely out of order." He points to leading the WNA as a reason for taking on a new approach to writing an academic book after successfully writing three books. Phillips says the repeated attention to "really identifying the stakes of your argument" pushes him into a new writing process: writing a book completely out of order in a quest to find that central argument. Todd and Madison are currently working on writing projects, too. Madison is co-authoring what she calls a "review paper" with a colleague in her home department of psychological science. While she is an expert on the content, she is new to the review paper genre. She points to serving as faculty facilitator of the WNA as central to helping her "have true discussions with people" about different genres of writing. These conversations are informing her current work. She admits she has read review papers, but "reading isn't the same as talking about the process of writing [which] has really helped me a lot with this specific collaborative study." Finally, Todd is writing in response to a call for papers. He finds that the WNA helped him with discipline, motivation, structure, and accountability. His story kept returning to these four terms. He describes how he wanted to lead by example and was concerned he would "lose face a little bit" if he came to a WNA meeting without working on his own writing. He tries to set time aside each morning to write a response for the call for papers and describes this time as "depositing some money … I pay myself a little bit" before moving onto teaching responsibilities. All three faculty facilitators readily provide examples of how serving as faculty facilitators shapes their writing practices by pointing to their current writing projects and skills or dispositions honed through the WNA that they are leveraging to complete these projects.

Todd and Madison also focus their stories on self-confidence. Both admit to struggling with writing and feeling a bit hesitant to lead a writing group. Todd says that he is open with his colleagues about coming "to the table with my own hang-ups … I'm a flawed writer." He says that prior to his involvement in the WNA, he "didn't really think about writing and making that part of my scholarship." Madison states she initially joined the WNA as a participant because "I obviously struggle with writing … writing itself can be a daunting task." Both point to how leading the WNA increased their self-confidence as writers. Todd says doing so "definitely enhanced my own self-efficacy as a writer." Madison offers that "having to lead the [WNA], in a way, forces you to feel more confident with it. And you end up realizing how much you know that you didn't know

you knew … I think that was probably the biggest benefit of how it helps me in my approach to writing." While Phillips's story did not focus on struggles with writing, he did mention that, like Madison, he ended up realizing he knows more about academic writing and the publication process than he previously thought. When Michael asked Phillips to serve as a faculty facilitator, Phillips said he began to "reflect on some of the things that I had accomplished with all of their challenges and pitfalls … I thought that if I could help people navigate those, it would be a nice thing to do." Here, we note that Phillips's service with the WNA pushed him to reflect on his writing accomplishments and use these accomplishments as a springboard to help others.

Phillips, Madison, and Todd articulate how leading the WNA supported their perception of themselves as writers; Phillips points to specific writing techniques that changed; Madison and Todd point to behaviors and dispositions that changed. All three highlight the importance of slowing down and coming together in community, of writing together, of gathering—in-person or virtual—to talk writing. As Todd states, "I fall sometimes into my own bad habits when I'm out of that community." And Madison observed, "I felt more conscious and more aware of my writing process because I had to lead [participants]." The act of slowing down to come into community is at the heart of changes to writerly identity our faculty facilitators could articulate. Both slowing down and building community, we argue in the final section, work against neoliberal imperatives that demand speed and competition.

MAKING MUSIC TOGETHER

Writing groups mean building community through slowing down, coordinating resources, and striving collectively for better prose. Even when the outputs may be single-authored publications and presentations, the nature of a writing group means that any publications that came from the writing group were communally generated and nourished. We see writing groups, particularly the act of leading a writing group, as a move toward community that is counter to neoliberal imperatives that are driving many decisions within U.S. higher education. We use the phrase *neoliberal* with a definition and attributes in mind. The definition comes from legal scholar Voyce (2007) who defined neoliberalism as "policies of competition, deregulation and privatization" (p. 2055). Sociologist Mulya offered three hallmarks of neoliberalism: "marketisation, competitiveness, and standardisation" (2019, p. 87). Both Voyce and Mulya highlighted the central role of competition. The additional traits characterizing neoliberalism, we argue, rotate around the idea of speeding up productivity. Deregulation as a method for speeding up productivity; outsourcing to private companies as a method for speeding up productivity;

standardizing as a method for speeding up productivity. U.S. higher education is witnessing a push toward increased worker productivity and seeing the use of competition (e.g., faculty against faculty) as a vehicle for arriving at this productivity more quickly. In this chapter, we offered a counter to these impulses by hearing stories from faculty who support the publishing of other faculty, who support slowing down and working in community with others.

Here at the close, we extend Mulya's (2019) work to our local context. Like us, Mulya situates himself in the work of faculty development. His article, published in the *International Journal for Academic Development*, specifically considers how faculty might partner with undergraduate students for research projects to contest neoliberalism. Mulya addresses in turn each of the hallmarks of neoliberalism—marketisation, competitiveness, and standardization—and offers the practice of partnering with students on research projects as a method for countering each hallmark. For example, by focusing on "community and belonging" within a partnership, we combat drives toward competition that are inherent in neoliberal forces (p. 88). While we are not engaging with students-as-partners praxis, an exciting approach gaining currency across higher education, we take up his broader arguments and extend them here to our work. Like Mulya we believe, and our qualitative data supports our belief, that "community and belonging" arise in meaningful ways for our faculty facilitators. They quell impulses toward competition by setting aside time for 12 weeks to come together and work and learn and write together. Community and belonging shaped the writerly identity of the three faculty facilitators. Moving forward with the WNA, we will intentionally design opportunities for continued community and belonging by seeking out faculty participants from across varied disciplines and ranks and including university staff who also engage in academic writing—like our colleagues in student affairs. Through encouraging a variety of faculty and staff, we can help faculty build a broad network of communal support.

Community and belonging were central themes we found. So, too, were themes of slowing down. While Mulya does not directly address speed as a hallmark of neoliberalism, we see speed as central to how the free market infringes on higher education. Thus, slowing down is a deliberate act designed to counter neoliberal impulses and an act that profoundly shapes writerly identity. We take seriously theories and practices of slowing down articulated in books like *The Slow Professor* (Seeber & Berg, 2016) and slowing down as a method for assuaging midcareer faculty burnout (Mulholland, 2020). What we learned about slowing down from our three faculty facilitators can help shape how we intentionally embed slowness into future iterations of the WNA.

Ultimately, we will seek methods to emphasize community and slowing down as a method for supporting faculty writing development and countering

neoliberal impulses. We encourage readers, especially those working within faculty development, to specifically design and redesign programming to counter neoliberalism. These damaging imperatives play out differently across campuses and contexts and countries. To topple these imperatives, we need to adopt locally specific faculty development programming. Through developing these kinds of programming opportunities, we can ensure that we all are making music together.

REFERENCES

Belcher, W. L. (2009). *Writing your journal article in 12 weeks: A guide to academic publishing success.* Sage.

Boice, R. (1985). The neglected third factor in writing: Productivity. *College Composition and Communication, 36*(4), 472–480. https://doi.org/10.2307/357866

Brantmeier, E., Molloy, C., & Byrne, J. (2017). Writing renewal retreats: The scholarly writer, contemplative practice, and scholarly productivity. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, *36*(2). https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0036.205

Cox, M., & Brunjes, A. (2013). Guiding principles for supporting faculty writers at a teaching-mission institution. In A. E. Geller & M. Eodice (Eds.), *Working with faculty writers* (pp. 191–210). Utah State University Press.

Eodice, M., & Cramer, S. (2001). Write on! A model for enhancing faculty publication. *Journal of Faculty Development*, *18*(4), 113–121.

Gray, T., Madson, L., & Jackson, M. (2018). Publish & flourish: Helping scholars become better, more prolific writers. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, *37*, 243–256. https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0037.203

Mulholland, J. (2020). Slow down: On dealing with midcareer burnout. *MLA: Profession*. https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0037.203

Mulya, T. W. (2019). Contesting the neoliberalism of higher education through student-faculty partnership. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *24*(1), 86–90.

Patel, L. (2019). Turning away from logarithms to return to story. *Research in the Teaching of English, 53*(3), 270–275.

Seeber, B. K., & Berg, M. (2016). *The slow professor: Countering the culture of speed in the academy*. University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442663091

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350225282

Stornaiuolo, A., Smith, A., & Philips, N. (2017). Developing a transliteracies framework for a connected world. *Journal of Literacy Research, 49*(1), 68–91. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.9.2.12

Tuck, E., & Wayne Yang, K. (2014). R-Words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry for youth and communities* (pp. 223–247). Sage.

Tulley, C. (2018). *How writing faculty write: Strategies for process, product, and productivity*. Utah State University Press.

Voyce, M. (2007). Shopping malls in India: New social 'dividing practices.' *Economic and Political Weekly, 42*(22), 2055–2062.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Harvard Business Review Press.