SECTION 3. INSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The third and final section of this collection focuses on some of the more macro-level issues relevant to WAC: how programs evolve over time, how WAC coordinators are trained in diverse institutional contexts, and how global/international contexts align (or do not). This section works to situate WAC within larger cultural, historical, and institutional contexts, reminding us that understanding our histories is as much about propelling us forward as it is reflecting on what has been. Furthermore, as we examine the histories of our programs, there is value in taking up what it means to leverage our histories toward programmatic sustainability on our college campuses. For example, Fabrizio et al. discuss how WAC fellows develop problem-solving skills at two colleges within the City University of New York (CUNY), which support how organizational units address complex problems related to student learning. This demonstrates the ways in which WAC programs can not only recognize but leverage their strengths amid institutional challenges.

Moreover, learning from the past aids us in navigating forward through new terrain. It engages with questions of the responsibilities of WAC as a field—to its students and its practitioners. Chapters in this section explore important questions, such as: How is English as the primary language for WAC scholarship inhibiting our collective understanding of global contexts, of evolving and adapting into more inclusive programs? How are we supporting the next generation of teachers, administrators, and scholars? What is the future of WAC?

Andrea Fabrizio, Linda Hirsch, Dennis Paoli, and **Trudy Smoke** open this section with a historical perspective on the complex CUNY WAC Program, contrasting the models implemented at Hostos Community College and Hunter College in particular, both of which are Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs). Fabrizio et al. reflect on the successes and challenges of these programs as they have matured, highlighting the values of a partnership between the two colleges that led to the sharing of ideas and practices for more sustainable programming. In Fabrizio et al., WAC coordinators in two different institutions describe the way that they learned their roles as an evolving collaborative process, which is crucial to negotiating "the challenges of local program building while navigating CUNY policies" (p. 175). The chapter can be generative for readers who seek to examine the intricacies of sustainability and how programs navigate and adapt through institutional changes and challenges of funding, staffing, faculty development, and curricular reach.

Following this exploration of programming and professionalization, **Mandy Olejnik, Amy Cicchino, Christna M. LaVecchia,** and **Al Harahap** consider the development of WAC coordinators from the perspective of graduate students and new WAC coordinators. The chapter represents a roundtable discussion of the possibilities for graduate students to engage in professional development. Olejnik et al. argue that growth in administrative and professional support of WAC administrators needs to occur in tandem with growth of programmatic initiatives. In their chapter, which is adapted from their roundtable session at the Fifteenth International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference, the authors ask important questions of the WAC community regarding support for graduate students, early career scholars, and other faculty placed in positions of managing WAC programs. Their chapter also extends conversations of access.

Further extending the conversation to spaces outside of the United States, **Estela Ines Moyano's** chapter highlights the importance of instruction locale and disciplinary learning by making a powerful argument about the radical nature of writing pedagogy relevant to the WAC community and especially to WAC scholars in the region of Latin America. Some may take it as a given that writing will be taught as a general education requirement and even within a specific major or discipline. However, the teaching of writing in a Latin American educational context via WAC can be seen as an innovative idea in strengthening student persistence—which more people, including college and university administrators, are starting to embrace. Because of what writing can mean and what it can do to support student learning (e.g., moving from writing to master textual comprehension to writing that strengthens disciplinary learning through meaning-making), we see this embrace as significant especially given the fight that countries in Latin America and others around the world have made and are making to preserve their democracies. This chapter teaches us that writing programs can enrich students' processes of learning in academic and political networks that, as Moyano suggests, allow for progress and growth within research, community-oriented work, and students' development in their future professions. Even though Moyano does not explicitly mention writing for democracy and social change, her work adds to the momentum of what writing can mean for students and faculty across disciplines who navigate various social, political, and professional contexts related to critical reflection and disciplinary learning. Her work welcomes an expansive readership to this very collection.

Similarly, **Alena Kačmárová, Magdaléna Bilá,** and **Ingrida Vaňková's** chapter addresses questions of whose languages are privileged in scholarly publishing and the sustainability of these practices. While WAC work is often focused on educational locales, we also must take into consideration how our scholarly practices are communicated and disseminated, and how those choices limit access

to scholars whose languages are not English. In their chapter, Kačmárová et al. examine the conflicts at play specifically between Anglo-American and Slovak writing conventions, and they offer insights into the implications of this dissonance, especially for Slovak scholars.

This chapter is followed by a deep reflection by **David R. Russell** on the history of WAC's endurance and sustainability, which is significant to our understanding of how writing has shaped educational reforms. By examining WAC's impact through a comparison and contrast approach with other "across-the-curriculum" movements, Russell's chapter positions readers to further understand the reach and scope that WAC has had in higher education. It is through this history and an "across-the-curriculum" lens that we not only come to understand and appreciate WAC's impact on higher education, but how writing is mobilized in various networks of learning.

As we aim to assess the impact of our programs and communicate to our institutions their significance, this history can be vital in highlighting not only what writing is but what it does at our colleges and universities. For example, Russell mentions how "WAC is often supported by—and supports—a large network of writing centers, with a long history of service to the wider university community, whereas mathematics tutoring centers typically do not have that campus-wide history or outreach" (p. 240). In the example, we observe collaborative practices through WAC's involvement in supporting learning and university service—practices that are further exemplified by Macauley, Childers, and Jones within this proceedings. These practices might be shared with broader institutional stakeholders to show how WAC is integral to teaching and learning.

Furthermore, Russell reflects on the issues that we continue to grapple with including how we support teaching and learning through writing and communication. He argues that the future of WAC should involve collaboration with other related "across-the-curriculum" programs, specifically communication across the curriculum (CXC) and quantitative reasoning (QR) across the curriculum. He also calls for more collaboration between WAC and the current movement for general education reform. We see this as crucial especially as colleges and universities review their general education curricula and the role of writing in the digital age.

Concluding this section and collection is a revision of the third plenary session given by **Al Harahap, Federico Navarro, and Alisa Russell**. In this chapter, the authors examine both how and what it means to position our programs toward decolonial, equitable, antiracist, and socially just futures. We learn that striving toward such futures is not in addition to WAC sustainability, but vital to achieving it. We know that our student populations continue to shift, and this is a trend we see in the United States and in countries like Chile where students once classified as "non-traditional" are now in the majority. They have disrupted

a script that has historically aimed to reserve educational access to a select few —one that secures itself through dominant deficit discourses of writing. However, Harahap, Navarro, and Russell remind us that the challenge we face is how we will embrace what it means to position ourselves as connectors of writing on our college campuses. How will we re-create our identities and innovate our programs toward equitable and socially just futures? Through a crowdsourced document of action items they collected, we learn that being more aware and deliberate of our work as a discipline can be messy, but it is an ongoing and necessary process if we are to enact changes that are not only framed by our reflections but our actions. This work is not only a way of knowing but a way of being and this can shape how we embody WAC on our campuses both now and in the future.

Through these last two chapters and this collection, we can also understand the immense task before us in not only continuing WAC's momentum but addressing the challenges before us and moving forward with an urgency for innovation and adaptability. It is vital that we continue to shape how the field adapts and works through the changes, challenges, and opportunities that are evident in higher education both now and in the future.