CHAPTER 1.

WRITING-ENRICHED CURRICULUM: A MODEL FOR MAKING AND SUSTAINING CHANGE

Pamela Flash

University of Minnesota

To provide a foundational framework for ensuing chapters in this collection, this chapter overviews the genesis and design of the WEC approach and details components of the WEC model developed at the University of Minnesota and adopted in other institutional settings. From its grounding principles and basis in WAC/WID and educational research, to its systems for engaging academic faculty groups in creating, implementing, and assessing locally relevant undergraduate writing plans, the WEC methodology is outlined and substantiated with departmental case studies. Finally, this chapter identifies six essential features of the WEC model and considers ways in which these features represent shifts from established WAC/WID programming.

The writing-enriched curriculum model, or WEC, enjoys a certain commonsensical appeal. As compositionist and rhetorician Kathleen Blake Yancey remarked during a consulting visit in 2009, "What I want to know is why everyone isn't *already* doing this. It just seems so obvious." Her question was logical because what we have in WEC is a tested strategy for putting control of writing instruction and assessment into the hands of the people best positioned to make informed, locally relevant decisions about instruction and assessment—namely, a department's faculty. Still, anyone who has overseen an academic initiative knows that obvious and actionable are not conjoined characteristics. Putting a comprehensive program of curriculum development into the hands of people who don't always, or even often, agree on matters related to writing, instruction, or much else might be a dicey proposition. How is it, then, that a faculty-directed model, one that locates inside a department's regularly scheduled faculty meetings, focuses on contentious beliefs about writing and instruction, and

welcomes expansive candor has succeeded, endured, and spread? Fifteen years into WEC's implementation, with a majority of my research university's undergraduate departments enrolled in the program, and with an increasing number of WEC adaptations underway in colleges and universities across the country, we're in a good position to pursue that question, to probe the model's design, development, impacts, and portability. In this chapter, I lay some groundwork for our probe by tracing the model's genesis, explicating its constituent moves, and distilling its six critical features (departmental location and control, conceptual orientation, grounding in data, use of an external mediator, forms of support, and sustainability). These features, detailed at the end of this chapter, provide insight into the model's potential and clarify differences between WEC and established writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in the discipline (WID) initiatives.

In essence, WEC is a facilitated process designed to support the integration of relevant writing and writing instruction into departmental curricula and to increase the rate at which students' writing meets local faculty expectations. A department's faculty works toward these hinged goals by engaging in a sequential process of generating, implementing, and assessing comprehensive documents called writing plans. In its plan, the faculty articulates local writing and instructional values and plans for instructional change. Importantly, in meetings convened to generate plan content, members are urged to talk candidly and think collectively—often for the first time—about what they believe to be true about discourse-relevant writing and locally-feasible forms of instruction. They're supported in making pragmatic decisions about which, how, and where desired writing abilities are (or might be) supported within their curricula, about structural or instructional interventions and modifications they'd like to enact to better integrate writing and writing instruction and what forms of support are needed to implement those interventions and modifications. Ultimately, all these insights, decisions, and requests are compiled into the plan which then moves through an ongoing sequence of implementation and revision over the course of the next decade. Plan revisions are partially informed by regular cycles of direct writing assessment, panel ratings of capstone-level writing against faculty-identified, graduation-level writing criteria.

Contextualized intellectually, WEC emerges from a confluence of research currents and pedagogical movements. Indeed, one reason for the model's apparent obviousness is that research and practices that help us interpret its impact and potential have been in the air for decades. In ways that I'll signal in this chapter (and others in this collection will scrutinize in more thorough detail), WEC enacts elements of influential and pragmatic educational theories that include backward design and valid evidence-based assessment (Broad, 2003; Huot, 2002; Messick,

1989; O'Neill, 2003; Wiggins & McTighe, 1998) and department-based, cyclical action research (Kemmis et al., 2014). Its emphasis on iterative, local data collection and local stakeholders' interpretation of those data draws on long-established ethnographic research methods and the interplay between emic and etic perspectives (Goodenough, 1956; Harris, 1976; Pike, 1954). Aligning with more current scholarship, WEC operationalizes research into ways that student writers transfer writing insights from one curricular location to another (Nowacek, 2011; Yancey et al., 2014, 2018) and provides opportunities for the faculty to identify and address critical points of influential conceptual struggle (Adler-Kassner et al., 2015; Meyer & Land, 2006). In these ways, the WEC framework is geared to catalyze change from within departmental activity systems (Engstrom et al., 1990; Russell, 1995; Walvoord, 2000) and to increase what educational theorist Michael Fullan calls a faculty's "change capacity" (Fullan, 2016). Finally, with hindsight I can see that the model's durability and portability rely on its conscientious consideration of components and heuristics helpful to sustainable program development (Cox et al., 2018; Fullan, 2005).

As to methodological forebears, WEC has drawn philosophical and logistical inspiration from an array of institutional programs implementing faculty-centered curricular reform. The facilitative approach Michael Carter, Chris Anson, and Deanna Dannels have used to engage departmental faculty groups in identifying writing and speaking outcomes at North Carolina State University (Anson, 2006; Anson et al., 2003; Carter, 2002;) has been particularly influential. Although NCSU's approach to working with departments involves multiple comprehensive components, it was Carter, Anson, and Dannel's approach to conducting disarmingly generative faculty meetings that helped to launch the design of WEC. At Seattle University, John Bean and colleagues developed a similar assessment-based approach, and collaborated with departments to building "writing infused" curricula (Bean et al., 2005). From George Mason University, the deliberate approach Terry Zawacki and colleagues took to embedded, departmental WAC work and especially to devising multimodal programmatic assessment (Zawacki et al., 2009) inspired WEC's menu of formative local and programmatic assessments. Finally, the model's grounded methodology, its recursive practice of putting locally collected writing samples, curricular maps, and assessment data into the hands of departmental faculty members in order to prompt their formative interpretation, was inspired in large part by the dynamic criteria mapping processes Bob Broad developed for surfacing context-relevant writing values (Broad, 2003). So, while the WEC model and WEC acronym were developed at the University of Minnesota, elements of its approach have been theorized about and implemented in diverse intellectual and geographical contexts.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Implementing the WEC model involves daily travel into diverse departmental subcultures, curricular structures, genre norms, and teaching practices. An established grounding in principle helps balance customization with consistency. From its inception, our WEC activity has been guided by the following five interconnected principles relating to the nature of writing and writing instruction:

- that writing is an articulation of thinking and involves choosing among an array of modes or forms, only some of which involve words,
- that writing is instrumental to learning and as such is continually developed and is the shared responsibility of all academic disciplines,
- that those who infuse writing instruction into their teaching require ongoing, partnered support,
- that unchallenged, tacit-level conceptions of writing and writing instruction inform the ways writing is taught and the degree to which writing is meaningfully incorporated into diverse undergraduate curricula,
- that systemic, curricular incorporation of writing into "content instruction" can be most meaningfully achieved when those who teach are provided multiple opportunities to articulate, interrogate, and communicate their assumptions and expectations.

The first two of these principles, and particularly the second, will sound familiar to anyone working in WAC; they're entwined in our shared programmatic and theoretical DNA. The third, with its "ongoing, partnered support" clause may raise a few eyebrows, particularly among those more familiar with the episodic forms of instructional support (e.g., the workshop or instructional consultation). The final two principles in this list are particularly foundational to WEC methodology and will be evoked throughout this chapter and in the chapters contributed by others who have adapted the model.

WEC MODEL GENESIS

In *Sustainable WAC*, Cox et al. suggest that people interested in establishing durable writing initiatives will find less value in narrative accounts of individual, contextually idiosyncratic programs and observation-based analyses than in analytic frameworks and tested administrative heuristics (Cox et al., 2018). I agree, and therefore preface the following abridged account of WEC's institutional backstory by clarifying that it's my intention to highlight ways that the model developed to address *shared* (rather than institutionally idiosyncratic) circumstances.

When, in the early 1990s, 28% of respondents to the University of Minnesota's annual student exit survey reported that they'd been required to write no more than two ten-page papers in the course of their entire degree programs, a faculty taskforce was convened to address this question: "How can we ensure that students in all degree programs receive adequate writing instruction?" This committee's interest in dispersing writing and writing instruction into all disciplinary curricula and its insistence that "students should be asked to write more often, in contexts that give greater purpose to their effort" (Task Force on Liberal Education, 1991) inspired them to propose an ambitious four-course writing-intensive (WI) requirement. In the mid-nineties the University Senate agreed, and in 1999, the initiative began full implementation. The hope was that a decentralized, yet uniform, cross-curricular requirement might deliver sustained attention to writing throughout students' undergraduate experiences.

In 2001, as the newly appointed WAC director, I began to insert myself into lots of departmental faculty meetings in each undergraduate-enrolling college. My interest was in gauging the extent to which our bi-directional approach—our combination of top-down writing intensive requirement with bottom-up, elective workshops and consultations—was successfully moving us toward our goal of what Anson, Hall, and others call a "vertical incorporation" of writing (Anson, 2006, p. 110; Hall, 2006, p. 6). By vertical incorporation, Anson and Hall refer to writing's intentional and expanded relevance up the ladder from course-specific, to departmental, collegiate, and ultimately, institution-wide systems. To get a sense of how department faculty thought this was working, I began with logistical questions: "Which of your courses have been certified as writing-intensive? Why were those courses selected? Who teaches them? How well is all this working?" In response, I was given an earful of confusion and consternation. Why, departmental faculty wanted to know, was a certain course certified WI when a certain other course—a course that invariably involved a *lot* of writing—was not? Why should a course that was not designated WI include any attention to writing? Yes, of course academic writing is vitally important, some acknowledged, but was it reasonable to ask them to add writing to their already chock-full courses, particularly in the face of expanding course enrollments and diminishing TA support? Was it *un*reasonable for them to expect that students would enter their courses having developed *basic* writing proficiency somewhere else? What, after all, were students learning in their *writing* courses? Inevitably, someone would pipe up to ask about what, if any, concrete incentives the administration was prepared to offer to induce them to teach these courses.

These initial discussions with faculty groups surfaced what seemed an intractable dilemma. Regardless of department and discipline, faculty participants articulated a variant of the same three-part claim: (1) student fluency in relevant

forms and styles of writing was absolutely critical to scholarly success in their fields of research and study, 2) insufficient numbers of students in their courses were demonstrating the writing abilities they, as discourse insiders, were looking for, and (3) *they* couldn't be expected to address this problem because they were not experts in writing or writing instruction. This is a wearyingly familiar impasse to anyone engaged in WAC work. It's this sort of situation, after all, that inspired David Russell to suggest that "WAC exists in a structure that fundamentally resists it" (Russell, 1991, p. 295) and Susan McLeod to characterize WAC professionals as missionaries, diplomats, and Peace Corps volunteers (McLeod, 1995).

Instead of arguing with faculty groups, I scheduled myself into even more of their meetings, electing to pursue rather than contradict this set of assumptions. I revised my line of questioning, looking for specifics. I asked, for instance, "What sorts of things do you write and publish in mechanical engineering? In apparel design? In forest resources? Can you refer me to some examples?" "What sorts of things do you ask *undergraduates* to write? Can I take a look at some samples?" "What are some of the routine writing challenges students face here?" Responses to these questions were illuminating both for what was said and for what was not. Faculty members' current writing projects rarely looked anything like the writing projects they were assigning to undergraduate students. In some departments, particularly those that prioritize technical or design-oriented modes, a few bold instructors insisted that writing played no role at all in their research or teaching. And yet complaints about the quality of student writing remained plentiful, impassioned, if still vague: it's disorganized; it's uninteresting; it's not clear. My follow-up questions, "When you say unclear, what can you tell me about what makes it unclear?" "How might you describe the sort of organizational logic you look for?" "How critical is that structure relative to other features?" weren't so readily answered. It was in these awkward silences, as these faculty colleagues sat searching for answers to these questions and they described and questioned the writing they were doing and the writing that their students were doing, that I realized we had hit upon a situation with enormous change-making potential. If the specifics of their writing-related expectations were hidden from them, was it any wonder that meeting these expectations could feel confusing to students or that the prospect of incorporating writing instruction into their teaching could confuse faculty? It was in discussions like these, I understood, rather than in unilateral WI requirements, that advances could be made toward the goal of integrating relevant writing instruction into all degree programs.

After years of WI implementation, was our bi-directional approach to WAC working? From the sounds of things, the answer was no. Although by some metrics our WI requirement was achieving success in that many hundreds of WI courses were on the books and filling, our cross-curricular writing requirement

and corresponding programs offering elective instructional support weren't catalyzing sustainable systemic change. Pedagogic insights and strategies sparked by instructional consultations and workshops with individual instructors weren't catching on in departments. WI courses remained atomized and over-burdened. As a faculty participant from horticultural science remarked on the last day of my annual five-day Teaching with Writing seminar, "Oh great, now I have to go back to my department where nobody talks about this stuff. I'm going to get dumped with teaching *all* the WI courses!"

My meetings in departments had made it apparent that our writing integration stalemate had at least two causes: (1) the writing-intensive requirement and instructional support offered through our WAC program focused on individual courses rather than curricular systems and (2) unchallenged faculty assumptions about discourse-relevant writing—about what it should look like and how it is best learned—presented powerful roadblocks to the initiative's goal of integrated writing instruction. No matter what changes we might require of individual courses, we would fail at activating a systemic, curricular embrace of writing instruction if by "writing," the University intended lengthy prose-based papers, and if by "writing instruction," the University intended didactic explications of grammatical structures or the provision of lengthy diagnostic commentary on multiple, lengthy drafts. These problematic and inaccurate assumptions obstructed a view of assigned writing tasks as a way of moving students toward the department's curricular objectives, as a tool to conceptual learning, and thus worth integrating into departmental curricula. Systemic change would require entirely different perspectives about the relevance of writing to a department's shared curricular goals.

Thus, our 2006 question revised our 1990 question. In 1990 we'd asked, "How can we ensure that students in all degree programs *receive adequate writing instruction*?" In 2006 we asked, "How can we ensure an *intentional and sustainable infusion* of relevant writing instruction into our diverse undergraduate curricula?" Fresh from all those faculty meetings, I recognized that finding meaningful answers to this new question would help us to shift responsibility for designing the curricular integration of writing into the hands of departmental faculty members, the people who are in the best position to determine what's meant by relevant and what intentional infusion might look like in the context of their curricular structure and pedagogical norms. Because discourse and departmental norms are dynamic, we were going to need to engage the faculty in a process that Kemmis et al. call "a self-reflective spiral of cycles of planning, acting and observing, reflecting and then re-planning . . . successive cycles of improvement" (2014, p. 2). The model we piloted and subsequently institutionalized implements this spiral by participating in an ongoing cycle of creating, implementing, and assessing undergraduate writing plans.

THE WRITING PLAN

Writing plans are documents composed of five sections (see Table 1.1). A department's faculty establishes a broad description of writing's relevance to a discipline and field before identifying a list of writing abilities they expect of undergraduate majors. From there, they work in a reverse-engineering mode to describe where, in their course offerings, explicit attention to developing named writing abilities does or might occur. These writing abilities are translated into a menu of grading criteria from which departmental faculty members can select and adapt items to specific courses and assignments. Because these criteria are also used in triennial ratings of capstone-level writing facilitated by the WEC team (more about this later in this chapter), they stand as benchmarks in assessing the impact of the plan over time. Once these steps have been accomplished, the faculty proposes activities and changes they'd like to undertake over a specified period to effect curricular integration of relevant writing and writing instruction. All these insights and plans are compiled into a document that moves through multiple editions and follows an evolutionary path from initial and exploratory to departmentally sustained.

Table 1.1. Five sections included in the undergraduate writing plan

Section	Topic
1	Characteristics of writing in the broad discipline
2	Writing abilities expected of graduating majors
3	Curricular address of expected writing abilities
4	Methods and criteria used to assess writing
5	Proposed activity and support

Although each writing plan follows a similar outline and although some of the writing expectations, when broadly construed, are shared (see Yancey, this volume), these plans highlight differences in discourse expectations, departmental culture, and pedagogical preferences. The plan developed by my university's art history department, for example, contrasts in all sorts of ways from the one developed by our mechanical engineering department. In art history, where students can take courses like "Baroque Art in 17th Century Europe," or "African American Cinema" in no pre-established order, the faculty's list of graduation-level writing abilities includes the expectation that students "develop and fully prosecute an argument throughout their work, so that the presentation of all forms of evidence (e.g., historical information, visual observation, analysis of existing literature) clearly relates to and further develops the core thesis" (Department of Art History,

2015). In its early edition writing plans, the faculty emphasized a need to support the on-time completion of high-quality senior papers. To achieve this, the faculty focused on piloting a capstone course that would provide seniors, despite their disparate research foci, with a structured and paced workshop experience. In an adjacent move, the department developed an annual senior paper prize to be awarded to papers that most effectively demonstrate proficiency with writing criteria the faculty had listed in its writing plan. To publicly recognize award winners—and to publicly reinforce attributes of successful art historical writing—the department also launched an annual research symposium and award ceremony. Over the years, this event began to attract standing-room-only crowds which inspired the department chair to characterize it as, "*the* event of the year." Based on these successes*,* art history used its second and third-edition writing plans to propose strategies for exposing pre-capstone students to desired writing abilities in courses throughout its lower- and upper-division curricula.

In the Department of Mechanical Engineering, on the other hand, where the undergraduate curriculum is constructed of carefully delineated course sequences and where desired abilities include, "record[ing] and analyz[ing] activity related to laboratory and design projects," and "visually represent[ing] technical concepts and designs in ways that explain their salient features" (Department of Mechanical Engineering, 2016), re-gathering students from diverging curricular pathways and ensuring on-time graduation isn't a big concern. Because engineering courses move according to predetermined paths, the faculty was able to embed writing activities of increasing sophistication into courses in all years of their major. Of more concern to mechanical engineering faculty is persuading majors of *why* they would want to attend to writing and of *how*, specifically, they can go about meeting writing requirements. Acting on these concerns, the mechanical engineering faculty attained support for a graduate student who developed a series of genre-specific writing guides which include, "The Problem Set," "The Lab Report," and "The Design Proposal." Collectively, these guides make a case for discipline-relevant acts of audience-based communication and contradict the notion that writing is an import from an alien discipline. Exploded diagrams and annotated excerpts help mechanical engineering majors see that documenting their logic as they solve computational and design problems is fundamental to the work they'll be doing in courses and in the field. The published style guides are incrementally inserted courses and referred to where students are first introduced to these different kinds of "deliverables." (An excerpt from the Problem Set Style Guide can be seen in Figure 1.1.)

In my work with the mechanical engineering faculty, I initially raised questions about whether autodidactic materials of this sort would make much impact on student writing. Might these resources end up on a dead website, unused and

increasingly out of date? I was quickly overruled. According to my colleagues in mechanical engineering, shelf-life was not a problem as not much changes in these genres ("a problem set is a problem set!"). I also learned that a willingness to refer to ancillary manuals and to comply with specifications and instructions may be distasteful to me but is routine for engineers. After conducting a controlled test of the problem-set style guide, implementing it in one section of a thermodynamics course and comparing students' problem sets and grades against those derived from a section where it wasn't used, the faculty was satisfied with the results and henceforth made the guides a required part of course materials. In these two disparate examples, we see ways in which the WEC model is driven by departmental faculty (rather than by the WAC consultant) and adjusts to address departmental norms and practices.

Figure 1.1. An excerpt from a mechanical engineering writing style guide in which expected components of a problem set are specified using an annotated example. Rhetorical purposes (noted in the green annotations) are interspersed with specifications (noted in the blue annotations). Evaluative comments pertaining to the sample are also provided (in yellow annotations) (Adams & Durfee, 2011).

DEVELOPING FIRST-EDITION WRITING PLANS

A first-edition writing plan is generated in a series of faculty discussions, each one focused on one or two questions related to local writing and writing instruction and each grounded by faculty review and interpretation of a form of locally collected data (see Table 1.2). Importantly, the discussions take place within a department's regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Although some department chairs may be quick to suggest that WEC discussions get assigned to a voluntary subcommittee, we're usually successful in dissuading them from this move. As Michael Carter suggests in his forward to this volume, surfacing challenges and resistance is a vitally important to the WEC process. If the resulting plan is going to succeed in overcoming internal roadblocks, those roadblocks need to become apparent. To this end, it has proven critical to involve a critical mass of departmental instructors, a group that intentionally includes people who think that talking about undergraduate writing is important *and* people who think that this topic is irrelevant and thus any discussion about it is a waste of their time. As I have evidenced elsewhere (Flash, 2016), these facilitated conversations can be transformative, triggering changes in instruction by surfacing and disrupting tacit-level assumptions about writing and writing instruction, assumptions that can cause some faculty members to resist the notion that they are the right people to support students' development as writers.

In each of these meetings, the department faculty peruses and interprets locally derived data and, in reaction to framing and clarification questions supplied by a WAC consultant, generates content, section by section, for its writing plan. These meetings are typically audio-recorded so that the discussion can be summarized and subsequently distributed back to the faculty, making this one more form of data that the WAC team collects and routes back to the department as grist for discussion. The recurring provision of local data and their collective interpretation are critical components of WEC's grounded and inductive epistemology. In the role of curious and facilitative interlocutor, a WAC consultant can help the faculty engage in the sorts of constructive discussion that they tell us would be impossible otherwise. A faculty member who participated in a 2017 focus group study affirms this impression: "The process was very helpful for getting the entire department to articulate understandings that . . . had never really been voiced or articulated. And, I think we discovered that our discipline is so closely linked to *writing*, not simply to communicating findings." (WEC Focus group transcripts, 2017). Another focus group participant, when asked what element of the WEC processes seemed most useful in effecting change, responded this way: "It was that group discussion; I don't think we would've had that just by going through faculty meetings. I think it

needed to be someone asking those questions as an outside person to have us come and realize, 'Oh, we're not talking about writing the same way at all!'" (WEC Focus group transcripts 2017).

Table 1.2. The order and content of four WEC meetings in which department faculty creates a first-edition writing plan

Topic	Questions Addressed	Data Discussed	Writing Plan
Meeting #1 (M1)			
Characteristics of writing	What are the noticeable features of academic and professional writing in this department's discipline and subfields?	Samples of student writing collected from gateway-level, midway-level, and capstone-level courses	Section 1
Desired writing abilities	What writing abilities should students in this major be able to demonstrate by the time they graduate?	Stakeholder surveys (students, faculty/instructors, professional affiliates)	Section 2
Meeting #2 (M2)			
Curricular address of expected writing abilities	Given the department's desired writing outcomes, how is writing instruction best integrated into its undergraduate courses? What forms does this instruction take? With which of the desired writing abilities do students typically struggle?	Curricular maps, matrices, schemes	Section 3
Meeting #3 (M3			
Methods and criteria used to assess writing	How is student writing best assessed in this department? How might desired writing translate into valid grading criteria?	Samples of capstone-level student writing	Section 4
Meeting #4 (M4)			
Proposed activity and support	What forms of action and support are needed to optimize the integration of relevant writing instruction into this department's curriculum? What forms of support are needed to enact these plans?	List of potential plan implemental activities mentioned previous meetings	Section 5

Because WEC processes require considerable logistical and contextually savvy, departments appoint a faculty member to serve an embedded WEC coordinator. These individuals—we call them faculty liaisons—broker the fit between departmental culture and WEC activity and take a leading role in coordinating the entire endeavor. At the start of the process, they make strategic choices directing our collection of local data and ensuring that a critical mass of departmental colleagues engage in (and are thus represented by) the faculty discussions. Ultimately, liaisons draft and vet editions of writing plans and oversee iterative implementation and assessment of these plans. Thus, the importance of these faculty leaders to the success of WEC programming cannot be overstated. Serving as inside players and links to the WAC team, they successfully maintain departmental motivation and follow-through at all stages of WEC activity. If the approach is going to fulfill its faculty-driven mission, if the process is going shift responsibility for department-relevant writing instruction over to departmental faculty, WAC consultants need to be careful not to overstep. They can co-plan and co-facilitate meetings, collect and present local data, document discussions, and they can serve as important implementation partners, but they can't run the show or author the writing plan.

FACULTY MEETING 1

In the first and arguably most important of four WEC meetings, a department's faculty takes up two questions that align with the first two sections of its writing plan: "What are the noticeable features of academic and professional writing in this department's discipline and subfields?" and "What writing abilities should students in this major be able to demonstrate by the time they graduate?" To prompt discussions that are more concrete than abstract and unrealistically aspirational, we distribute results from stakeholder surveys and samples of undergraduate writing.[1] As meeting participants react to these data and start generating ideas, the consultant transcribes their ideas onscreen. Refraining from altering words or adding new ideas, the consultant types away and asks clarifying questions, like, "Right here, when you say that you expect cogent analysis, what can you tell me about how that looks? What are the analytic moves that work toward cogency?" Or, "You say you want writing that is clear and precise. What typically muddies desired clarity?" Or, "You all seem to agree that you want students to demonstrate control over grammar and mechanics. What does that mean, really? At what point in the writing process might that expectation be

---

1   Elsewhere (Anson et al., 2012; Flash, 2016), I've provided detailed descriptions of survey results, recounted faculty members' interpretative reactions to these data points, and provided evidence of the impact these discussions have on the ways that meeting participants are conceptualizing writing and writing instruction within the context of their teaching.

particularly germane?" Responses to these queries are added to the onscreen document which is then shared with liaisons to use and work-up into their draft writing plan's first two sections. In this way, the faculty groups are engaging in the practice of unearthing a shared set of writing concepts or key terms, a critical component of teaching for transfer (Yancey et al., 2018).

By the end of the first meeting, faculty members will have generated two rough lists: the first uses adjectival phrases to characterize the broad territory of their disciplinary discourse as composed by academics and professionals; the second is composed of writing abilities the local faculty expects from their graduation-level majors. To achieve this result, they will have engaged in a dynamic and unusual process, a discussion about some of the hallmark epistemological moves and discourse features guiding not only their teaching, but their *own* intellectual and pedagogical work. In most cases, this discussion is illuminating and unusual, i.e., not at all what they were expecting when they elected to allow "the writing people" to invade their faculty meeting to talk about "writing."

FACULTY MEETING 2

As we begin the second WEC meeting, the faculty reviews (and inevitably fiddles with) its lists of discipline-relevant writing characteristics and expected undergraduate writing abilities before moving on to consider where writing instruction occurs—or might occur—within the collection of service, core, and elective courses they offer. To prompt this analysis, they look at curricular schematics (maps and matrices) constructed from survey-generated data. In departments where poring over complex matrices may be more repellent than productive, instructors prefer to present their colleagues with oral profiles of the courses they teach and the writing they assign. In our architecture department, for example, the faculty chose to pin course materials up on modular walls and move gallery-walk style from one course to another, listening to colleagues describe how writing and design were addressed in their courses and then discussing their reactions.

Shifting faculty focus from negotiating lists of individual writing abilities to considering how and where these writing abilities might receive explicit attention in departmental offerings is a primary objective of Meeting 2. Now that the faculty has developed a group of exit-level criteria, consideration of where and how students are developing these valued writing abilities as they take lower- and upper-division courses can expose instructional gaps and opportunities. This meeting can help faculty members recognize that what they emphasize in course instruction and grading may not align with the writing abilities they collectively prize. It can also reveal the random location of writing-intensive courses, and the limited power these courses have if they are isolated within the curriculum. Finally, Meeting 2 discus-

sions allow the faculty to locate opportunities for overt instructional reinforcement or collaboration, increasing the likelihood that students will be able to transfer what they've learn about writing between course contexts, helping them to develop the awareness they need to serve as "agents of integration" (Nowacek, 2011).

FACULTY MEETING 3

In their third WEC discussion, faculty participants shift focus again. Here, in order to generate content for the fourth section of their writing plan, they move from considering the curricular location of writing activity to considering the ways in which student writing is assessed. More specifically, they use this meeting to discuss ways in which their list of expected writing abilities translates into valid grading criteria they might adapt for use in their courses. An excerpted example from one meeting's outcome can be seen in Table 1.3. As I'll describe later in this chapter, these criteria are used in triennial WEC-sponsored rating panels, a form of direct assessment in which a faculty panel assessed students' capstone-level writing against the faculty-articulated list of criteria in order to assess the impact of WEC activity on student writing.

Table 1.3. Partial list of the biology program's expected writing abilities translated into writing criteria

Writing abilities (generated in Meeting 2)	Writing criteria (generated in Meeting 3)
By graduation, students should be able to . . .	The text . . .
Explain the relevance and importance of the topic under study.	Conveys the importance of an experiment by placing it into the context of a broader scientific field, highlighting known experimental precedents, and naming overall goals of the successful experiment.
Define a hypothesis in order to clarify the purpose of the work.	Presents a hypothesis as a direct statement that can be tested with experiments conducted by the student.
Explain results logically (and not necessarily chronologically) so that the results section presents a readable, efficient expression of experimental outcomes.	Demonstrates the writer's ability to select, present, and describe experimental procedures/results by providing only essential information such that the procedure can be reproduced by other scientists familiar with the field of study.
Discuss experimental results and data concisely. (Explanatory writing should effectively communicate only the essential information for reproduction of the experiment by one skilled in the art.)	Draws final conclusions from results and places them in context of the goals of the experiment. Includes key results that support or refute the hypothesis in concluding remarks.

Faculty Meeting 4

In the fourth and final meeting in this series, the faculty develops content for the fifth section of its writing plan. In this section, members describe ways of putting ideas into action, activities that are intended to help them make some headway in addressing issues surfaced in the meetings. Proposed activity is designed around questions like, "Now that we've figured out what we're looking for, how can we incorporate our group of desired writing abilities into our courses?" "How can we do a better job of sequencing writing instruction into our flat and random-feeling curriculum?" "How can we motivate students to see the relevance of writing to their major courses of study?" In addressing these sorts of questions, some departments are keen to continue curricular research, to create a comprehensive portrait of writing instruction as it currently occurs in departmental courses and what the writing instruction looks like. Others are ready to take structural or pedagogical action by restructuring capstone courses or developing a series of customized workshops or locally relevant instructional materials.

It is at this juncture that the liaison, in possession of four comprehensive meeting summaries, sets about drafting the department's first-edition writing plan. Once drafted, the plan is circulated to departmental colleagues for comments and, ultimately, approval. On our campus, completed plans are presented for approval to our Campus Writing Board, a subcommittee of our faculty senate which evolved from the advisory board I assembled when I began to develop WEC. Other institutions implementing the WEC model assign approval responsibilities to other existing or newly established writing- or curriculum-related committees.

IMPLEMENTING WRITING PLANS

Approval of a writing plan moves a department from plan creation to plan implementation. As I've described above, implementation activities are informed by the faculty's insights and its recognition of departmental circumstances, so these activities vary significantly in both scope and design across departments. Two brief case studies illustrate divergent and contextually informed approaches departments have taken to writing plan implementation.

The first involves the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior, where, after reviewing survey results and curriculum matrices, faculty members recognized two significant points of disconnection. First, they realized that they had very little idea of where, how, or even if, students in core and elective courses were being offered any explicit writing instruction. As a result, it was difficult for individual instructors to know how, or even whether, they were positioned

to introduce, to reinforce, or to simply expect key writing abilities. For students taking their courses, this murkiness made writing instruction into something of a hit-and-miss affair, and as a result, they sensed that the writing they were asked to do in their major was due more to individual instructor preferences than because writing was considered a discipline-relevant mode of thinking and communicating. Second, in reviewing stakeholder survey data, the faculty found little connection between student and faculty perceptions of high priority writing abilities. Student data revealed a majority opinion that the appropriate use of scientific terms and the ability to create precise descriptions were most important. Faculty members, on the other hand, gave top ranking to synthesizing disparate ideas, interrogating existing research and sources, and to reporting complex data using logical organization. It should also be noted that elsewhere in the survey, faculty members registered their collective and specific disappointment with students' abilities to demonstrate synthesis and interrogative reading in the writing students turned in.

Wanting to remedy their hazy understanding of what their colleagues were up to and wanting to better understand why student and faculty populations valued writing abilities so differently, the faculty contracted a graduate student to gather writing assignments and grading criteria from each of their undergraduate courses and to analyze these instructional materials for explicit mention of the writing abilities they valued. This analysis confirmed their growing suspicion that the most highly valued writing abilities were the least likely to be explicitly mentioned in writing assignments or grading criteria. Frequent and explicit mention was, however, made of accuracy and precision. Recognizing the wisdom of making their tacit-level expectations more explicit, the faculty partnered with their WAC consultant to develop a set of specific instructional approaches and materials that would provide students with low- and high-stakes writing activities that require the use of synthesis and guide students to approach texts analytically. The faculty liaison unveiled these curricular tools in two well-attended faculty/instructor workshops and posted materials on a departmental site. In this way, this department's faculty went about making durable instructional changes using just the sort of empirical methodology for which it is known: analyze some data, generate a question, develop a protocol for gathering more data, analyze results, and conclude with a substantiated answer to the question.

In youth studies, a department within our School of Social Work, writing plan implementation has looked quite different. This department's faculty is composed of a small core of tenure-track faculty and a large collection of part-time "community faculty" members. The latter are professionals in discipline-related fields who teach one course per semester or per year. To the faculty liaison's surprise, despite not being paid to attend faculty meeting of any kind,

the community faculty embraced WEC meetings and the entire amalgamated group focused productively on building consensus around a set of desired writing abilities that includes the expectation that student writers be able to convey "personal and practice-oriented reflections that concretely describe a situation," and that they "evidence their experience and where necessary, draw from relevant theoretical, scholarly, and community sources" (Department of Youth Studies, 2018, p.8).

In the first year of plan implementation, as youth studies' faculty members began to intentionally incorporate these writing expectations into their teaching, concern began to arise about the actual fit between their list of writing expectations and the academic needs and abilities demonstrated by students enrolled in their courses. Youth studies attracts a high percentage of first-generation college students and students from traditionally underrepresented populations and both full-time faculty and part-time community faculty members are uniformly focused on addressing the needs and interests of these students. In its second-edition plan, therefore, the faculty proposed to address alignment concerns by developing assignments that provide students with opportunities to blend spoken and written expression into writing projects. To this end, a cohort of faculty members became trained in digital technologies and developed digital story assignments that invite students to create multimodal texts, illustrating stories from their lives and literacy traditions using videos, soundtracks, and scripted narration. To highlight the relevance of assigned writing to students' future careers, the department organized annual panel discussions in which program alumna discuss the writing they do as educators, activists, and researchers. Both implementation activities are designed to enhance the relevance of writing to departmental coursework.

A few years into the process, when discussing a batch of disappointing assessment results, members of the faculty again asked questions about the relevance of the criteria they'd named to the needs of students they enroll. This time around, in its third-edition plan, the faculty outlined a more direct approach. Enacting disciplinary expertise in designing comprehensive program evaluation protocol, the faculty designed an incremental series of activities that will involve a group of undergraduate majors in discussing and formally evaluating the department's writing plan, the faculty's current set of writing criteria, writing assignments, and approaches to writing instruction. Students' plan assessments will be shared with the entire departmental community as the faculty determines next step activity. Also, in collaboration with its WAC consultant, the department has launched an annual series of faculty discussions focused explicitly on issues of academic literacy and writing assessment in communities defined by race, gender, class, culture, and language.

WEC ASSESSMENT METHODS

Perpetual data collection and multimodal assessment processes are hardwired into every phase of the WEC model. These assessments serve two primary purposes: (1) they provide a department with information that can help its faculty develop, implement, and revise iterative writing plans and (2) they provide WAC consultants with information that will allow us continue supporting departments and also to maintain or modify components of the model itself. As illustrated in Table 1.4, these two purposes are addressed with four interrelated questions and associated indices, timing, and primary audiences.

Whether a WEC-sponsored assessment maneuver aims at gathering quantitative or qualitative information using direct or indirect instruments, the data generated by these instruments are brought to department faculty members for their interpretation and analysis. In response to the first assessment question listed in table, baseline assessment data, including de-identified writing samples, responses to stakeholder surveys, and comprehensive curricular maps and matrices, are discussed as the faculty develops its first-edition plan. Once that plan has begun implementation, additional assessments are designed to address the second assessment question. Here, the department is measuring impacts of the specific writing and instructional activities it has designed or requested. Whether the faculty has elected to organize writing-oriented programming (e.g., workshops, guest speakers, teaching consultations, or discussions), develop resources (e.g., assignment archives or student-facing support sites), implement structural changes (e.g., alter course sequencing or develop new courses), or continue to conduct curricular or instructional research (e.g., code faculty assignments and grading criteria to assess their alignment with the list of desired writing abilities), these activities are assessed in accordance with departmental goals.

Finally, to address questions about the impact WEC activity is having upon the quality of student writing (the fourth question listed in the table), departments participate in episodes of direct writing assessment every three years, beginning almost immediately after passage of their first-edition writing plan. In these assessment sessions, panels of raters measure a set of randomly selected capstone-level writing samples against lists of criteria that departments include in Section 4 of their writing plans. (On my campus, rating panels are composed of faculty members and others who have been selected by the department's liaison and, where feasible, we add "writing specialist" raters, usually a member of the WAC team.) As I've delineated elsewhere (Anson et al., 2012; Flash, 2016), these sessions begin with preliminary training and norming activity and conclude with detailed debriefing sessions. Debriefed reactions are captured

and compiled along with the numeric rating scores into comprehensive reports which are subsequently brought into faculty meetings for collective interpretation and discussion.

Table 1.4. WEC's multimodal menu of assessment questions, instruments, timing, and primary audience

Assessment Question	Instruments or indices	Timing	Audience
What is the **initial status** of writing and writing instruction in a participating department?	WEC stakeholder surveys (students, instructors, professional affiliates) Meeting summaries Curricular maps and matrices	Baseline (year 1)	Department faculty
	1st edition Writing Plan		Department faculty and interdisciplinary approval board
What effect does creating, implementing, and assessing Writing Plans have upon **writing instruction and curricular design** in participating departments?	Implementation activity assessment	Variable (developed and conducted by departmental faculty)	Department faculty
	2nd and 3rd Edition Writing Plans	Year 2; Year 5	Department faculty and interdisciplinary approval board
What effect does creating, implementing, and assessing Writing Plans have upon **student writing** in participating departments?	Rating student writing against faculty-articulated criteria	Triennially	Department faculty
	Student Experience in Research Universities (SERU) survey	Biennially	Provost's Office
How successfully does the **WEC model design and process** function to support the iterative development, implementation, and assessment of departmental Writing Plans?	Writing Plan review	Year 1 (first edition); Year 2 (second edition); Year 5 (3rd edition)	Department faculty and interdisciplinary approval board
	Liaison survey	Annually (2009-2016)	WAC consultant team
	Faculty focus group	2017+	WAC consultant team

The step of bringing the results back to the faculty for its reaction is critical to ensuring the valid interpretation of results and to sustaining a department's active involvement in the program. In cases where comparative results are reported (i.e., at least two triennial rating sessions have been conducted), members of the faculty are familiar with the criteria and courses from which samples were drawn and are thus best situated to interpret and address rising or dropping scores. As co-facilitators in these discussions, WAC consultants emphasize two questions: In what ways do the assessments contained in these reports align with or diverge your own evaluations of student writing? What next-step activities do these results inspire? Answers to these questions underscore the formative intention of the rating process and steer discussions toward action and forward momentum. Ultimately, by providing departmental faculty with recurring opportunities to both interpret and *use* assessment results, we're integrating considerations of content, criteria, and consequences in order increase the value implications of ratings (Huot, 2002; Messick, 1989; O'Neill, 2003).

In a final note related to the triennial rating of student writing, I'll point out that the decision of whether or not to report on rating results in its publicly posted writing plan (or elsewhere) is left entirely to the faculty. This provision can have a powerfully disarming impact on faculty members who might suspect that the WEC Program in general (and the rating process in particular) will be somehow used by central administration to justify department changes or budget reductions. Realizing that the WEC Program invests in the process (collecting and redacting samples, paying raters, generating reports) but relinquishes control over the data helps cement faculty trust in the process, and this trusting relationship is central to the model's power to provoke and sustain local change.

Aside from triennial ratings, a tool for addressing questions about WEC's impact on student writing abilities can be found in student engagement surveys like the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)[2] or the Student Experience in Research Universities survey (SERU). On our campus, students' responses to items on the biennial SERU survey have allowed us to compare the frequency with which students inside and outside departments participating in WEC engage in high-impact writing and learning practices. As members of my institution's institutional research office reported in 2015, students majoring in WEC-participating majors reported engagement critical learning habits and abilities at a higher frequency than did students whose majors had yet to engage in the program (Office of Institutional Research, 2015). These habits and abilities included concept mastery, thinking critically and/or creatively about

---

2   For more on the piloting and addition of 27 writing-related NSSE items, see Anderson, et al. (2017).

course content, and understanding the criteria instructors have used to grade their writing.

Lastly, several related data points help us assess the design of the WEC model—its sequence of meetings, data collection, and assessment and so forth. One indication of its success is the rate of elective enrollment. On my campus more than sixty departments have elected to enroll in the process and we add more each year. On other campuses where our WEC model is being adapted, willing departments queue up waiting to begin. Another indication of the method's effect is the rate at which faculty-authored writing plans are approved. On my campus, writing plans are submitted to the Campus Writing Board, a subcommittee of the faculty senate. Approval is based on a set of criteria that assess the plan's ability to address interests and concerns expressed by a critical mass of departmental stakeholders and the feasibility of proposed activity. Finally, model components can be assessed by faculty participants. On my campus, we've used annual liaison surveys, focus groups, and biannual all-liaison meeting to capture the impressions (and advice) of faculty members in participating departments. Over the past 15 years, we've relied heavily on data generated from these assessments as we've built and refined the WEC model.

SIX CORE FEATURES

In the process of collaborating on this book project, Chris Anson and I negotiated a list of WEC's core features, the practices and principles that have proven fundamental to successfully promoting and sustaining departmental implantation of writing-enriched curricula. Our negotiation required us to separate essential elements from site-specific adaptations and logistical apparatuses we've developed to organize and administer WEC programs on our sites. The resulting list is included in Anson's Introduction to this volume and I provide a briefly annotated version here.

DEPARTMENTAL LOCATION AND FACULTY CONTROL

Academic departments elect to participate in a WEC initiative and, to the extent possible, WEC activity takes place inside regularly scheduled departmental faculty meetings to ensure participation of most (if not all) members. In generating its writing plan, the faculty is invited to review locally derived data sets and to define writing in ways that are disciplinarily and departmentally relevant. Most importantly, the faculty achieves consensus on a list of graduation-level writing abilities its members expect of students enrolled in the department's major(s) and makes collective decisions about how and in which of their courses these

writing abilities will be addressed with explicit forms of instruction. Members determine what (if any) instructional innovations they'd like to implement to ensure that the writing instruction they offer in their courses adequately supports the development of desired writing abilities, and they decide how they'll measure the success of these innovations. Finally, WEC activities are led by a member of the faculty who takes on the role of WEC Faculty Liaison. In all these ways, WEC methods are designed to leverage and enhance a department's existing structural and interpersonal connections. WEC doesn't focus on writing in a discipline per se; instead, its deliberate focus is on writing in a *department*.

Conceptual Orientation

As I've described here and elsewhere (Flash, 2016), the WEC approach takes aim at inconspicuous but powerful presumptions that circle around writing and writing instruction. Because these ideas—convictions about what does (and does not) count as effective academic text, suppositions about how and where academic writing should (and should not) be taught and learned—can exert profound influence on instructors' willingness to devote instructional time to writing in their own courses, we begin with them. Each facet of the model, from its capacious definition of writing (visual marks conveying meaning) to its perpetual collection of diverse data sets and its insistence on departmental faculty control, is designed to loosen convictions that writing and writing instruction are irrelevant to specific fields, courses of study, or individual instructors.

Data Use

As professional scholars and researchers, faculty members in virtually all academic disciplines spend significant time analyzing various forms of data and developing a healthy mistrust for unsubstantiated hunches and hearsay. Intent upon provoking grounded and pragmatic discussion of writing and writing instruction, the WEC model leverages this disposition and skillset by hardwiring data collection and interpretation into all phases of its activity. In virtually all WEC meetings, those charged with creating writing plans as well as those charged with assessing WEC-related activity, faculty members review, analyze, and interpret locally derived artifacts, instructional models, and assessment data. As I've described, these data include stakeholder survey results, curricular matrices, rating reports, and samples of student writing. These data, intended primarily as springboards to discussion, help departments address questions such as: What forms of writing are being assigned and in which courses? What strengths and weaknesses are showing up in student writing? What effect is all this WEC

activity having on student writing? On our instruction? Without the grounding that data provide, these discussions would likely be composed of unreconcilable opinions which would make unified action hard to identify. Throughout the WEC process, WAC team members provide the service of collecting, preparing, presenting, and archiving local data that department members wouldn't have the time or resources to collect.

MEDIATION

At each stage of WEC activity, departmental faculty groups are joined by a WAC consultant, an outsider to the department and discipline but an insider to issues of writing and writing instruction. The model and approach are built upon the idea that a WAC consultant's ability to clarify issues and help catalyze changes that would have been unlikely otherwise resides in our ability to leverage what Susan McLeod describes as our *foreigner* status. The WAC consultant's advantage lies, says McLeod, in our "not being part of the local departmental power structure; they have no stake in disciplinary arguments . . . they can ask questions no one else can ask" (McLeod, 1995, p. 108). In WEC work, the role of foreigner is intentionally and consistently inhabited. As many contributors to this collection, Luskey, Emery, Fodrey, Hassay, and Sheriff among them, have affirmed, WAC consultants cede control, problematize expertise, hold ideas up to the light, listen carefully, and create an environment of shared liminality. In doing so, they enable frank and even transformative discussion that faculty participants tell us could not have occurred without the presence of a curious foreigner. Moving from writing pedagogy expert to curious listener and fellow discussant is a significant role shift for WAC consultants.

CONTINUOUS SUPPORT

Department chairs tell us that they would have been unlikely to agree to WEC if enrolling meant substantial amounts of extra work for themselves or their colleagues. When they understand that the WAC team will take care of WEC's administrative tasks, e.g., collecting writing samples, administering surveys, compiling results, summarizing meetings, putting together slides, organizing assessments data collection and reporting, their reluctance diminishes. Once a writing plan is moving through its implementation and assessment paces, members of the WAC team continue to offer support as needed, whether that means co-facilitating a requested workshop or meeting, helping report on assessment results or reviewing newly developed instructional materials. Where available, fiscal support in the form of stipends for faculty liaisons and seed money to

support the implementation of writing plans is supplied to departments whose plans are deemed to merit this support. Particularly in the context of a research university, even minimal funding provides both symbolic and pragmatic support.

SUSTAINABILITY

Each of the previous five features contributes to WEC's durability. The model's decentralized locations and distributed leadership roles enacted by departmental faculty members allow WEC to adapt to circumstantial disruptions and personnel changes that frequently threaten centralized WAC initiatives. Providing fiscal support for faculty-authored writing plans, plans in which the faculty outlines and justifies activities that they will take responsibility for successfully implementing and assessing, provides senior administrators with an alternative to one-size-fits-all funding for intra-department, difficult to assess, writing support. The model equips an institution's central administration with a means for granting differential and meritorious support to innovative and perpetually assessed curricular activity—just the sort of activity that is valued most institutional and collegiate accreditation agencies. In this way, the model works in an integrated bottom-up and top-down capacity. Finally, WEC's long-term process and deliberately paced scaling provides participating departments with time to pilot, assess, and revise their approaches to integrated writing instruction. Engaging departments gradually and in small cohorts has the added advantage of building community among departments who are at the same stage of programming. On my campus, as we near saturation for the undergraduate curriculum, we've begun to reach back to departments that have been implementing writing plans for ten or more years. We offer these "legacy departments" tools for testing and increasing the ongoing relevance and sustained implementation of their writing plans.

CONCLUSION

Despite the WEC approach's apparent obviousness, putting departmental faculty groups in charge of departmental writing instruction is neither a fast nor effortless business. Part of the effort WEC exacts may correspond to the changes it proposes to some familiar WAC methods. Like most WAC/WID programs, WEC aims to increase the curricular incorporation of relevant writing instruction and to graduate able communicators across majors. To achieve these shared aims, however, WEC activates shifts in *location* (from interdisciplinary and course-specific to departmental and curricular), *control* (from administration to faculty), stance

(from one of expertise to one of inquiry) and pacing (from episodic to enduring). Some aspects of WEC practice—the inductive approach taken by its consultants, its incremental cycles of engagement and gradual scaling, and its insistence on scheduling activity to take place within pre-existing faculty meetings for three examples—are unusual not only in WAC/WID circles but in the world of academic initiatives more generally. Perhaps more recognizable to community organizers than to academics, these practices are taken up in support of both immediate insights—the aha! moments that enliven a meeting—and long-term changes that result from increases in a department's collective capacity for change.

WEC's contribution to WAC/WID theory is its assertion that many long-standing roadblocks to writing-infused curricula can be dismantled by surfacing and collectively discussing instructors' tacit-level assumptions about writing and writing instruction. WEC's contribution to WAC/WID practice is its model, a framework of sequenced activity that manages to balance contextual malleability with reliable stability. As the other chapters in this collection evidence, the model's expanded adoption allows for its expanded and collective investigation. I look forward the continued work of WEC's community of practice.

REFERENCES

Adams, B., & Durfee, W. (2011). *Mechanical Engineering writing style guide: Problem sets*. University of Minnesota.

Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies*. Utah State University Press.

Anson, C. M. (2006). Assessing writing in cross-curricular programs: Determining the locus of activity. *Assessing Writing*, *11*(2), 100-112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2006.07.001

Anson, C. M., Carter, M., Dannels, D., & Rust, J. (2003). Mutual support: CAC programs and institutional improvement in undergraduate education. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, *6*(3), 13. https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.2003.6.3.06

Anson, C. M., Dannels, D., Flash, P., & Gaffney, A. H. (2012). Big rubrics and weird genres: the futility of using generic assessment tools across diverse instructional contexts. *The Journal of Writing Assessment*, *5*(1).

Bean, J. C., Caruthers, D., & Earenfight, T. (2005). Transforming WAC through a discourse-based approach to university outcomes assessment. *WAC Journal*, *16*, 5-21. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2005.16.1.01

Broad, B. (2003). *What we really value: beyond rubrics in teaching and assessing writing*. Utah State University Press.

Carter, M. (2002). A process for establishing outcomes-based assessment plans for writing and speaking in the disciplines. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, *6*, 4-29. https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.2003.6.1.02

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

Department of Art History. (2015). *University of Minnesota writing plan, 2ⁿᵈ ed.* University of Minnesota.

Department of Mechanical Engineering. (2016). *University of Minnesota writing plan, 3ʳᵈ ed.* University of Minnesota

Department of Youth Studies. (2018). *University of Minnesota writing plan, 3ʳᵈ ed.* University of Minnesota.

Engstrom, Y., Miettinen, R., & Punamaki-Girai, R.-L. (1990). *Perspectives on activity theory*. International Congress for Research on Activity Theory, Lahti, Finland.

Flash, P. (2016). From apprised to revised: Faculty in the disciplines change what they never knew they knew. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *A rhetoric of reflection* (pp. 227-249). Utah State University Press.

Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership & sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Corwin Press.

Goodenough, W. H. (1956). Componential analysis and the study of meaning. *Language*, *32*(1), 195-216. https://doi.org/10.2307/410665

Hall, J. (2006). Toward a Unified writing curriculum: Integrating WAC/WID with freshman composition. *WAC Journal*, *17*, 5-22. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2006.17.1.01

Harris, M. (1976). History and significance of the emic/etic distinction. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *5*, 329-350.

Huot, B. (2002). *(Re)articulating writing assessment for teaching and learning*. Utah State University Press.

Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research*. Springer.

McLeod, S. H. (1995). The foreigner: WAC directors as agents of change. In J. Janangelo & K. Hansen (Eds.), *Resituating writing: Constructing and administering writing programs* (pp. 108-116). Heinemann.

Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3ʳᵈ ed.) (pp. 13-104). Macmillan.

Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2006). *Overcoming barriers to student understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge—Twin Cities*. Routledge.

Nowacek, R. S. (2011). *Agents of integration: Understanding transfer as a rhetorical act*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Office of Institutional Research. (2015). *2014 SERU results for writing enriched curriculum participants*. University of Minnesota. https://wac.umn.edu/sites/wac.umn.edu/files/2019-09/seru_2014.pdf

O'Neill, P. (2003). Moving beyond holistic scoring through validity inquiry. *Journal of Writing Assessment*, *1*(1), 47-65.

Pike, K. L. (1954). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. Summer Institute of Linguistics. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015041850119

Russell. (1995). Activity Theory and its implications for writing instruction. In J.

Petraglia (Ed.), *Reconceiving writing, rethinking writing instruction* (pp. 51-78). Erlbaum.

Task Force on Liberal Education. (1991, May 6). *A liberal education agenda for the 1990s and beyond on the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota* (The Final Report of the Twin Cities Campus Task Force on Liberal Education). University of Minnesota.

Walvoord, B. E. F. (2000). *Academic departments: How they work, how they change*. Graduate School of Education and Human Development, the George Washington University.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Yancey, K. B., Davis, M., Robertson, L., Taczak, K., & Workman, E. (2018). Writing across college: Key terms and multiple contexts as factors promoting students' transfer of writing knowledge and practice. *The WAC Journal*, *29*, 42-63. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2018.29.1.02

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing*. Utah State University Press.

Zawacki, T. M., Reid, E. S., Zhou, Y., Baker, S. E., & Mason, G. (2009). Voices at the table: Balancing the needs and wants of program stakeholders to design a value-added writing assessment plan. *Across the Disciplines*, *6* [Special Issue], 1-14. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2009.6.1.03